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Abstract

On the edge of a large parcel sits a nondescript one-story cottage aging in place, its windows and doors boarded up and porch slightly sagging. Paint peels off the wooden clapboard siding and a rusted tin roof covers the original side gabled wood shingled roof. Riding my bike past the house while working as the Cultural Resource Management Intern at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park in summer 2022, I often missed it as I rode through the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood. Often, my eyes were being drawn to the antebellum era mansions I also passed heading to work. Through my internship, I had the honor of collaborating with the non-profit organization, Second Founding of America as well as with the homeowners/descendants as one of the NPS representatives researching the house and learning that it is an extant freedman’s cottage – virtually unchanged from its construction estimated to be in 1870. Freedman’s cottages are residences built during and immediately after the Civil War by formerly enslaved individuals seeking to integrate themselves and their families into full United States citizenry through the powerful act of exercising their newfound right to purchase land and build their home.

For too long, the house at 1313 Congress Street and the neighborhood where it is located, the Northwest Quadrant, has been overlooked, neglected, segregated, and ignored by formal preservation practices resulting in a threat of demolition by neglect and a white-washed historical narrative of Beaufort. This thesis covers the house and its associated social and built history, but the main purpose is to draw attention to the importance of conserving vernacular heritage. I argue that telling this story is a way that preservation practitioners can do the work of reconstructing preservation practice to be more equitable, inclusive, and encompassing so that Beaufort – and places like it – can begin to tell their whole histories.
Introduction

Driving from the coast of Los Angeles, California to the coast of Beaufort, South Carolina in May 2022 left me surprisingly little time to reflect – despite spending countless hours staring out at the landscape of the United States. I finished my final exams and began the journey to the opposite coast to start my internship with the National Park Service at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park in Beaufort, where I planned to spend the summer. Beaufort was unlike anything I had ever experienced, as was the rest of South Carolina. The state is rural and wooded, somewhat sparsely populated other than in major city centers, and seems frozen in an imagined “past” time with a lack of large-scale development projects that might otherwise replace historic patterns of landscape use – in short, the opposite of Los Angeles. Driving on “major” highways, I sometimes would not pass another car for miles.

Figure I.1: Roseida Road, Beaufort, SC. Many thoroughfares through South Carolina are quiet, heavily wooded, two-lane roads. Image Source: Realtor.com.
Though completely different from Los Angeles, I found it to be charming and beautiful for exactly what it was – a built and natural landscape changing much slower than the one I was used to in California. The true delight came when I entered the Lowcountry landscape. South Carolina’s geography is divided into regions based on the different landscape features. There is the Upstate which borders the Blue Ridge Mountains, the Midlands in the middle of the state, the Pee Dee in the northeastern region of the state, and finally the Lowcountry in the southeast corner of the state defined by its marshes, coastline, forests, and unique socio-cultural history.¹ I spent my summer in Beaufort, on the island of Port Royal, in the heart of the Lowcountry.

![South Carolina Counties & Regions: Upstate, Midlands, Lowcountry, & Pee Dee](https://livingupstatesc.com/upstate-midlands-lowcounty-pee-dee-what-does-it-mean/)

---

Beaufort County is, undoubtedly, defined by its coastline. The county is connected to the rest of the state, by its own “inland” region that is part of the mainland of South Carolina, but the majority of life takes place in and around the city of Beaufort itself, situated on the island of Port Royal and surrounded by other sea islands that characterize life in coastal South Carolina.

![Map of Beaufort County, South Carolina. Basemap Source: ESRI, 2023. Map Source: Emily Varley.](image)

Living on an island all summer was a much different pace than living in Los Angeles. I enjoyed my five-minute bike commute into work every day, waiving at neighbors I passed, walking past...
(and working in) perfectly intact 200-year-old buildings regularly, and being mesmerized by the miles and miles of marshy waterways that are like veins through the city and county.

![Image of Craven Street looking east in downtown Beaufort](https://explorebeaufortsc.com/craven-street-beauforts-avenue-of-history/)

Figure I.4: View of Craven Street looking east in downtown Beaufort. Spanish moss hangs from the live and water oak trees that line the city streets. Image Source: [https://explorebeaufortsc.com/craven-street-beauforts-avenue-of-history/](https://explorebeaufortsc.com/craven-street-beauforts-avenue-of-history/).

The city is recognized for its distinct sense of place and the entire town was placed on the National Register of Historic Places as a National Historic Landmark District in 1973.\(^2\) Within the district is Reconstruction Era National Historical Park, my place of employment through the National Council for Preservation Education internship program from May to August 2022.

While working with the team at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park, specifically with Nathan Betcher – my supervisor and the Park Historian – I researched multiple sites throughout Beaufort and learned many unique and compelling stories. Prior to my internship, I did not realize how little I knew about the Reconstruction Era in United States history, but after working with and learning from the incredible team at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park, I came to understand it’s importance in U.S. and world history. Park Superintendent Scott Teodorski, Park Rangers Chris Barr, Rich Condon, and Chanda Powell, Administrative Assistant Michelle Fassler-Garcia, Park Volunteer Gina Baker, interns Cam and Ash, Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Executive Director Victoria Smalls and Program Coordinator Tendaji Bailey as well as Beaufort County Library Historical Resource Coordinator Grace Cordial
welcomed me into the South Carolina Lowcountry and ignited in me a passion for researching, documenting, conserving, and spreading awareness about Reconstruction Era cultural heritage.

Through my internship, I met Billy and Paul Keyserling, life-long Beaufort residents and founders of the non-profit The Second Founding of America, that aims to “uncover the truth and to tell and teach missing parts of our nation’s history.” Like the National Park Service, their organization advocates for the conservation of sites and stories associated with the Reconstruction Era though they focus on Beaufort area resources. During my summer internship in 2022, I worked on multiple projects but collaborated the most with the Second Founding organization to research a potential Reconstruction Era resource: the house at 1313 Congress Street. Working with the Park Service and Second Founding, I had the incredible privilege of researching the property, interviewing descendants of long-term residents, and advocating for the preservation of the structure and the associated social and cultural history it embodies.

1313 Congress Street is located on the north side of Congress Street in the city of Beaufort, in Beaufort County, South Carolina. The house, sometimes referred to as the Stokes Cottage, sits on a rectangular .065-acre lot in the southwest corner of Block 100 according to the United States Direct Tax Commissioners plat. It is in the northwest corner of the northwest quadrant neighborhood of Beaufort. Starting in the southwest corner of the lot, at the intersection of Congress Street and Wilmington Street, the lot extends east forty feet, north one hundred feet, west forty feet, south one hundred feet. The land is flat, and the primary façade of the house is setback from the southern property line (Congress Street) approximately twenty-five feet. It is unknown if the house is in its original location as there is precedent of similar style houses being moved quite frequently, however, there is no evidence to suggest that this house was relocated.\(^4\)

1313 Congress Street is a rectangular one-story residential building with a side-gabled steeply pitched roof that follows the folk hall and parlor plan. It is an example of southern vernacular architecture known as “Freedman’s Cottages” for association with formerly enslaved people constructing homes for themselves during the Reconstruction Era of United States history (1861-1900) during and after the Civil War. It sits on brick piers for its foundation and is of frame construction. The primary façade faces south and contains a shed porch supported by unelaborated square columns. The entire house is covered in wood siding, without sheathing. The primary entrance is central and flanked by two symmetrical window openings. All three openings are covered in plywood; It is unknown if original doors and windows are extant. The
west façade contains one window opening covered in plywood and a vent directly above it. The east façade contains two window openings covered in plywood and a brick chimney extending from the ground to the roof of the structure. The structure was originally one unit deep, but a one-story, one-room addition was added to the north facing, rear façade to enlarge the interior space. A tin roof covers original shingles. The architectural style is reflective of the knowledge and familiarity that formerly enslaved people had with the “plantation slave houses” they were forced to occupy as enslaved people prior to the Civil War.5

Figure I.8: 1313 Congress Street. View Northwest. Photograph by Emily Varley, August 2022.

Figure I.9: West façade of 1313 Congress Street. View East. Photograph by Author, August 2022.

Figure I.10: East façade of 1313 Congress Street. View southwest. Photograph by Author, August 2022.
This thesis establishes an understanding of the socio-cultural history of Beaufort, South Carolina and places the house at 1313 Congress Street at the center of that narrative to document the rich multi-layered story of the house and the people whose lives make it special. It is a call to action to raise the alarm that current preservation practices in Beaufort, South Carolina as well as in the United States threaten this important structure with demolition by neglect or a restoration treatment which will erase parts of the house’s history. Most of all, this thesis humbly implores preservation practitioners to take up the burden of doing the “work of Reconstruction” and push back against the boundaries of formal preservation practice to begin reconstructing our field so that we might do work that is more inclusive, equitable, encompassing, and just. We cannot keep preserving sites, structures, objects, and places as we always have as it is resulting in a narrow-minded narrative that is essentially erasing the sites, structures, objects, and places that represent the whole of United States history.

Chapter one outlines life in Beaufort, South Carolina in the years leading up to and through the Civil War and establishes an understanding of the Reconstruction Era (1861-1900) in Beaufort. Chapter two documents the land development history of 1313 Congress Street and relies heavily on deed transactions and census records. Chapter three dives into the life of Edith Stokes and covers the social history associated with the house at 1313 Congress Street which came to be known as the Stokes Cottage around Beaufort due to Edith Stokes and her children and grandchildren’s lives there from as early as 1910 to present day. This chapter is structured by census records and illuminated by an oral history interview I conducted in July 2022 with Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes, surviving granddaughters of Edith Stokes and who shared with me their memories of their grandmother, the house, and life in Beaufort. Chapter four is split into two parts: Part one explains the preservation practices available in Beaufort at the local, state, and
federal levels and takes a critical lens to their use history in Beaufort. Part two discusses strategies for preserving vernacular heritage such as 1313 Congress Street and the larger Northwest Quadrant neighborhood where it is located in Beaufort. The conclusion summarizes findings and discusses further research opportunities which emerged out of this project. Most of all, it implores readers again to take up the burden of doing the work of reconstructing preservation practice so that our formal preservation practices can be used to safeguard, place-keep, and remember the heritage of all people in our communities.

Language, perspective, and argument are certainly not exempt from bias and nor is this thesis. My identity as a cis-gendered, heterosexual White woman from St. Louis, Missouri, influences my opinions, my style researching, and of course – my writing. Throughout the course of this research project, I strove to be open and tell a story about this house and the people who made it significant based on the evidence I encountered. There is certainly evidence I did not encounter, nor likely ever will, which might radically change the story of this place. More research is always necessary to continue evolving and telling fuller and more complete stories. As an outsider to South Carolina, to Beaufort, to the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, and to the Beaufort African American community, I did my best to respectfully and honestly tell the story of this place despite it not being my own. Without the generosity of Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes, who opened their home and their family history to me and the team at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park, none of this would be possible.
Chapter 1: The Antebellum Era, Civil War & Reconstruction in Beaufort, South Carolina

Pre-Civil War Life in Beaufort, South Carolina

Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade

The Trans-Atlantic slave trade is perhaps the single most impactful industry in United States and world history for its long reaching effects that continue to impact our lives. According to the Records of the Virginia Company of London, a ship arrived “about the latter end of August” carrying a cargo of “20. And odd Negroes” to be sold as slaves to the colonists in 1619. The arrival of the White Lion at Point Comfort in present day southern Virginia marked the beginning of the importation of abducted African people into North America as slaves and set off an economic revolution in the colonies that created the foundation for the United States to become a nation. In Charleston, South Carolina, the largest city in the Carolina colonies and primary port of entry into the Lowcountry, the importation and sale of African people officially began with the city’s founding in 1670 and continued until the abolition of the industry in 1808. During these years, “nearly 1,000 cargoes of enslaved Africans entered the port of Charleston” amounting to “almost one half of slaves imported to the US” entering through the Lowcountry. As a result, Charleston’s economy boomed and their population exploded, setting off unprecedented growth and creating the conditions for Beaufort to be founded approximately seventy miles to the south in 1711. Beaufort mirrored Charleston by embracing the system of slavery and hinging their entire economy and society on the wealth created by endorsing the violent abduction, importation, and enslavement of African people. Between its founding in 1711

---

and the abolition of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade in 1808, Beaufort established itself as a center for wealth creation for an emerging class of citizens, planters, who made their money by violently extracting labor from enslaved Africans and the Lowcountry landscape itself.\textsuperscript{8}

Figure 1.1: Advertisement in the \textit{South Carolina Gazette} Newspaper for Africans to be sold in Beaufort. Published in Charleston, SC. August 2, 1760. Image Source: newspapers.com.

Despite the industry’s abolition following Congress’s ratification of “An Act Prohibiting Importation of Slaves,” the Lowcountry did not suffer an economic fallout. In fact, Beaufort, Charleston, and other Lowcountry cities founded on the economy of the slave trade evolved to become powerful plantation economies that matured in the Antebellum period of American history and set the stage for the Civil War, Reconstruction, and life as we know it today in the United States.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{8} The story of slavery in the Americas, specifically of the violent abduction and enslavement of African people, is a story that has been told many times over because it is the foundational institution that created what we know and understand as the United States of America today. To learn more about the transatlantic slave trade, the middle passage, and other aspects of slavery in the colonies and early United States history please consider Louis Filler’s book, \textit{Slavery in the United States} (1998), this Library of Congress Blog Entry: \url{https://blogs.loc.gov/folklife/2019/08/beyond-1619/}, or this National Park Service Article: \url{https://www.nps.gov/articles/the-middle-passage.html}. There are also National Parks to visit in person which document and interpret these topics, a list of which is provided on their website: \url{https://www.nps.gov/subjects/enslavement/visit.htm}.

\textsuperscript{9} Nic Butler, “The End of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade,” in \textit{Charleston Time Machine}, produced by Charleston County Public Library, podcast, \url{https://www.cclp.org/charleston-time-machine/end-trans-atlantic-slave-trade#:~:text=On%20the%20first%20day%20of,slave%20trade%20into%20our%20country}. 
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Antebellum Slavery & the Plantation Economy

Historians date the Antebellum period of American history to the end of the War of 1812 and the start of the Civil War in 1861 and characterize it based on the socio-cultural and economic way of life that emerged during this period centered around slave plantations. In the Lowcountry, the “organized social system” that emerged placed the planter class at the top of an imagined social hierarchy and the people they enslaved at the bottom – viewed and treated only on their ability to create wealth and power for the people that owned them and the society that benefitted from their enslavement. African people enslaved in the Antebellum period and their African American descendants were of unimaginable value to the planter class because of their depth of knowledge on “the growing of rice, cotton, indigo, sugar, and a host of other plants” that enabled them to transform the Lowcountry wilderness into highly productive landscapes. The raw materials and crops produced by the enslaved people were high value commodities on the international market, however, the success and enormous wealth created for the planter class only came from the fact that they were not paying for the intensive labor necessary to plant, cultivate, harvest, and process the crops. Nor did they pay for the management, care, and facilitation of the plantation household, including the house itself, livestock, and any other services demanded of the enslaved people by plantation owners. In Beaufort, rice and indigo were early cash crops that enslaved people successfully produced and that created a foundation for the slave plantation economy to solidify, however, it was the crop known as Sea Island Cotton that ultimately set Beaufort and the rest of the Lowcountry on its course toward the Civil

War in 1861. Sea Island Cotton is a specific long-grain strain of cotton considered a luxury item that earned its name for growing exceptionally well on the coastal sea islands. As a luxury crop, it fetched high prices and production intensified to meet a growing global demand, resulting in South Carolina leading the nation in cotton exports between 1800 and 1860. Plantations produced and exported more cotton, increased their profits, and expanded their social and political power solely because they increased the amount of people they enslaved during the Antebellum period. In 1800, the South Carolina population counted 56.8% of the population as White and 42.3% as slave. By 1860, the numbers were more than flipped with 41.4% identified as White and 57.2% identified as slave. Between 1800 and 1860, slavery in the Lowcountry intensified to sustain the Antebellum economy and maintain plantation owners’ hegemony over the Lowcountry’s social and natural landscape.

Landscapes of Slavery – The Lowcountry Plantation

Though perhaps the Antebellum era plantation owners viewed the Lowcountry landscape as their own, it was and is fundamentally a Black landscape as it was shaped and created by the African and African American people enslaved throughout it and who eventually came to be the largest population group. The natural features of Beaufort include salt marshes, rivers, coastal plains, woodlands, and barrier islands, all of which contribute to the unique geographic setting of

---

14 This is not a complete history of the Antebellum period in United States, rather it is the intention of this section to acknowledge the slave-plantation centered society present in Beaufort, South Carolina in the years prior to the outbreak of the Civil War and the Reconstruction era. To learn more about the Antebellum period, please see John Michael Vlach’s book, Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery (1993), Editors Thomas J. Durant, Jr. & J. David Knottnerus’s book, Plantation Society and Race Relations: The Origins of Inequality (1999), or Dea Boster’s book, African American Slavery and Disability: Bodies, Property and Power in the Antebellum South, 1800-1860 (2012).
the Lowcountry. During the Antebellum period, the Beaufort economy evolved to rely entirely on the exploitation of enslaved people on plantations to continue to grow and create wealth and power for the planter class. The plantation itself was the organized geographic unit by which the planter class superimposed their imagined social hierarchy onto the landscape to subjugate both the people they enslaved and the natural environment. According to the first agricultural census of the United States, conducted in 1850, there were 881 plantations distributed amongst the four parishes in Beaufort County.\textsuperscript{16} Though each plantation contained unique features based on its natural terrain, resources, or even crop of focus, a development pattern emerged amongst them all that constantly reinforced the violent physical and social control that the planter class had over the people they enslaved and the land they owned.\textsuperscript{17} As noted, plantations differed based on their specific focus but it is worth including a detailed account of one Lowcountry plantation to illustrate the complexity of a plantation ecosystem and demonstrate the depth of knowledge, skill, and intensive labor performed by enslaved Africans and their descendants to create and manage that landscape.

Jehossee Island is a sea island located off the Edisto and Dawho rivers between Charleston and Beaufort, South Carolina that is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as part of ACE Basin National Wildlife Refuge.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16} Lawrence S. Rowland, Alexander Moore, George C. Rogers, \textit{The History of Beaufort County, South Carolina: Volume 1, 1514-1861} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 369.
According to their website, Jehossee is “steeped in the cultural past” but known most famously for being owned by South Carolina Governor William Aiken during the Antebellum period in which he enslaved over 800 African American people who made Jehossee Plantation “one of the most productive rice plantations in the area” as well as “the largest and wealthiest rice plantation in the South.”  

19 Enslaved African people, as early as the mid-1700s, first transformed the swampy sea island into a productive one using traditional ecological knowledge subjugated by their enslavers to create wealth for themselves.

---

Enslaved people created irrigation systems to harness the tidewaters, effectively re-shaping Jehossee into a series of productive rice fields or “impoundments” extant throughout the refuge today. Built features such as rice trunks remain throughout the landscape and serve as reminders of the knowledge and ingenuity enslaved people employed to create a successful plantation.\(^{20}\) Enslaved people also created a community for themselves on Jehossee where they could develop and practice distinct cultural arts, foodways, and lifeways, ultimately transforming the island into

---

\(^{20}\) A rice trunk is “a large wooden sluice, or trunk, which resembled a guillotine with the dimensions of a barn door. When opened at high tide, the trunk allowed the tide to flood the field. With the trunk closed, the water stayed on the crop.” Geographer Judith Carney argues that the rice trunks of South Carolina rice plantations are similar to devices used in West Africa to control the flow of water in other agricultural endeavors. Antoinette T. Jackson, *Speaking for the Enslaved: Heritage Interpretation at Antebellum Plantation Sites* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 74-77.
“their own landscape…at the margins of the plantation.”²¹ Both the working landscape features extant on Jehossee as well as the deep place-based community identity established on Jehossee illustrate that it is fundamentally a Black landscape. Jehossee Island is just one example of an Antebellum era plantation that retains many of its defining environmental features as well as built features through which we can begin to understand the hidden landscapes created by enslaved people so as to form a more complete understanding of Beaufort and all of the Lowcountry’s landscapes of slavery.


**Figure 1.4:** Rice Trunk Water Control Structures at Ace Basin National Wildlife Refuge. Image Source: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

**Architecture of Slavery – The Big House & The Vernacular**

In Beaufort, the planter class designed and constructed elaborate homes to display their economic wealth and reinforce their position of power within Antebellum plantation society,

---

many of which are preserved today as part of the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District. The plantation architecture of Beaufort that is extant today is, primarily, the homes of enslavers with the original 1969 National Register of Historic Places inscription going so far as to claim that “the glory of Beaufort is the total collection of great houses set in gracious space,” where “the plantations came to town.”22

The 2001 update to the inscription acknowledges that the area was originally designated “almost exclusively on the significance of the city’s antebellum history and architecture.” With such an emphasis on the architecture associated with the plantation class, the nomination downplays the

---

vernacular architecture of the Antebellum era that equally contributed to a built environment centered on the exploitation of slave labor.\textsuperscript{23} Coffin Point Plantation on St. Helena Island in Beaufort County, illustrates this issue exactly as its individual inscription on the National Register of Historic Places focuses on the architectural description of plantation owner’s home and only alludes to the larger plantation’s purpose of enslaving African Americans with a note that “No original outbuildings are in existence.”\textsuperscript{24} A plantation mansion alone conveys an almost apocryphal history in that the big house was only one feature of a larger working landscape “ensemble” that contained, primarily, architecture associated with enslaved people working to keep the entire operation going.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Coffin_Point_Plantation.jpg}
\caption{Coffin Point Plantation on St. Helena Island, Beaufort, SC. Image Source: Library of Congress.}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Today, much of the architecture that remains from the Antebellum period in the American South are examples of plantation owner’s homes rather than the vernacular architecture of slave quarters, barns, kitchens, outhouses, laundries, blacksmiths, stables, mills, smokehouses, dairies, icehouses, and other outbuildings that equally represent how Antebellum architecture was designed to reinforce the “complex institutionalized social system” that was plantation society.\textsuperscript{26} Despite this preservation bias, the full history of antebellum architecture is that it was both grand and imposing in the plantation owner’s house as well as simple and functional in the outbuildings built, utilized, and maintained by enslaved people that truly defined a plantation.

\textit{The Gullah Geechee People}

Despite biases resulting in countless studies of the planter class during the Antebellum period, in Beaufort as well as throughout the American South, there is a rich depository of information about the lives of enslaved and free Black people in Beaufort from that period that exists because of the persistent memory keeping practiced by the Gullah Geechee community. Gullah Geechee people are a descendant community of Black people living throughout the world who have distinct cultural traditions, including their own language – Gullah – that can be traced to the West and Central African people who were enslaved on the sea islands during the Antebellum period. Geographically isolated on sea island plantations, the enslaved Africans practiced indigenous African lifeways as well as developed new cultural practices and traditions to survive and build community for themselves despite their position as enslaved people.\textsuperscript{27} Descendant communities largely remained isolated until the 1950s when bridges were built

connecting the sea islands to the mainland, resulting in a de facto preservation of much of the Gullah Geechee cultural traditions first established during the Antebellum period by imported enslaved Africans relying on their skills, dietary practices, religious beliefs, and languages to survive. In 2006, Congress designated the Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor a National Heritage Area stretching from the coast of North Carolina to the coast of northern Florida to “recognize, sustain, and celebrate the important contributions made to American culture and by the Gullah Geechee” and to aid in the interpretation and preservation of “Gullah Geechee folklore, arts, crafts, and music” as well as associated “sites, historical data, artifacts, and objects.” The Gullah Geechee nation continues to thrive and preserves their heritage today.

![Figure 1.7: Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor. Map Source: National Park Service.](https://www.nps.gov/places/gullah-geechee-cultural-heritage-corridor.htm)

Today the Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission oversees the heritage area and conserves the traditions, knowledge, and experiences of the Antebellum era enslaved people who are the genesis of Gullah Geechee identity. Additionally, the Gullah Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission safeguards the places and spaces in which the Gullah community today continues to conserve and create Gullah Geechee heritage.30

Figure 1.8: *The Old Plantation* is a folk-art watercolor depicting enslaved African Americans on a South Carolina plantation in the late eighteenth century practicing a West African dance with instruments and dress of West African origin. Image Source: Wikipedia.

30 To learn more about the Gullah Geechee people, please visit their website: [https://gullahgeecheecorridor.org/](https://gullahgeecheecorridor.org/). Consider donating to and visiting the corridor to learn more about their cultural practices, foodways, and spirituality. The National Park Service also conducted a special resource study and environmental impact statement on Gullah Culture located on their website: [https://www.nps.gov/ethnography/research/docs/ggsrs_book.pdf](https://www.nps.gov/ethnography/research/docs/ggsrs_book.pdf).
Civil War in Beaufort, South Carolina

*Fort Sumter & The Battle of Port Royal Sound*

In December 1860, South Carolina declared their secession from the United States, arguing in their Declaration of Secession: “The constituted compact has been deliberately broken and disregarded by the non-slaveholding States, and the consequence follows that South Carolina is released from her obligation.”\(^{31}\) The compact they refer to is the Constitution of the United States, specifically its fourth article that states: “No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.”\(^ {32}\) In the minds of South Carolinians and the other states that followed with similar declarations, to secede from a country that disregarded its democratic compact and to form a new nation in which the institution of slavery was respected was both noble and justified because they believed that their entire way of life – the one built upon the violent enslavement, control, and torture of African American people – was threatened. Tensions between Northern, non-slave holding states, and Southern, slave-holding states grew throughout the Antebellum period, but it was the election of President Abraham Lincoln on November 6, 1860 that initiated the split of the Union and subsequent Civil War. Lincoln won seventeen states in total, all of which were in the North other than California and Oregon. His name did not even appear on the ballot in southern states apart from Virginia or the border states. With the highest recorded voter turnout in United States election history, the people had spoken

\(^{31}\) Confederate States of America, *Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union* (Charleston, 1860).

\(^{32}\) U.S. Const. art IV, § 2, cl. 3.
and the geographic divide between non-slave holding states and slave-holding states solidified.\textsuperscript{33} South Carolina, the first to secede and the first to strike, may have believed they were justified but in reality, their declaration of secession and bombardment of Fort Sumter in the quiet pre-dawn hours just off the coast of Charleston harbor was an act of domestic terrorism that launched the deadliest conflict in United States history. The Confederate victory at Fort Sumter prompted the newly sworn-in President Lincoln and his advisors to find a location for the United States to resist further Confederate aggression with a blockade as well as begin re-establishing Union control in the south. As battles between Union and Confederate forces waged the rest of the spring and into the summer and fall of 1861, Port Royal Sound – the natural harbor in Beaufort – emerged as an ideal location from which the United States could support the Union military.\textsuperscript{34} As the “deepest and most accessible harbor on the southern coast of North America,” control of Port Royal Sound was a strategic upper hand during military engagement and whoever controlled it could control most, if not all, of the southern coastline.\textsuperscript{35} On November 2, 1861, just seven months after the newly formed Confederate nation bombarded Fort Sumter, the Confederate citizens of Beaufort were warned that the “largest naval and amphibious expedition mounted by the U.S. Navy in the nineteenth century” was in route with a potential destination of Port Royal Sound. Much of the town’s White residents fled inland to Confederate strongholds throughout South Carolina. The planter class who had so blatantly broken their compact as United States citizens in defense of their own economic interests when seceding from the Union and forming the Confederate States of America watched in horror as they realized they would


\textsuperscript{34} Lawrence S. Rowland, Alexander Moore, George C. Rogers, \textit{The History of Beaufort County, South Carolina: Volume 1, 1514-1861} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 438-444.

\textsuperscript{35} Lawrence S. Rowland, Alexander Moore, George C. Rogers, \textit{The History of Beaufort County, South Carolina: Volume 1, 1514-1861} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 20.
need to evacuate their plantations on the Sea Islands or risk capture as prisoners of war. The people they enslaved were aware of what was happening, and November 7th is remembered as the “Day of the Big Gun Shoot” as the sounds of United States Navy guns could be heard all around the sea island plantations and in the town of Beaufort itself.

When remaining planters began fleeing Beaufort, many attempted to force the people they enslaved to go with them. Aware of stories of *de facto* freedom being granted to enslaved people by U.S. forces re-occupying slave-holding geographies, the Gullah Geechee people on the sea islands resisted their owners. On November 9, federal troops arrived in the city of Beaufort and found “some 10,000 enslaved people who for the first time in their lives experienced their freedom.”

occurred in Beaufort and the surrounding Union-held Sea islands, is known as the rehearsal for reconstruction.

---

Union Occupation of Beaufort

With the arrival of federal troops in Beaufort, the formerly enslaved people began the crucial work of reconstruction in Beaufort by negotiating more rights for themselves. As previously mentioned, rumors of *de facto* freedom spread throughout the slave-holding southern states during the Civil War, likely originating from Major General Benjamin Butler’s wartime proclamation that enslaved people who escaped to Union held territory would be designated as “contraband of war” and receive a new legal status and protection, different from that of a slave.37 One of the most well documented and earliest examples of a formerly enslaved refugee camp is Fort Monroe, located off the coast of Virginia, where more than 900 self-emancipated people lived, worked, and received an education under the legal status of “contraband” during the Civil War.38 In Beaufort, under the leadership of General Thomas W. Sherman, federal troops prioritized establishing Union control, fortifying the port, and staving off potential Confederate provocations, but the question of what to do about the former slaves loomed.

At first, Sherman adopted a policy of “leaving the slaves in Beaufort to their own devices” but this laissez-faire attitude proved insufficient as more and more enslaved people self-emancipated by escaping their masters and taking refuge in the Union held sea islands where they could access *de facto* freedom for themselves and their families.\(^{39}\) What is now known as the Port Royal Experiment was born when Union leaders realized that Sherman’s victory in Beaufort not only left him in control of the vast abandoned productive lands of the Lowcountry but of the some 10,000 former slaves now residing in the area under federal jurisdiction and that Beaufort could be, “an ideal testing ground to begin Reconstruction.”\(^{40}\)

---


The Port Royal Experiment

The Port Royal Experiment was the testing ground where formerly enslaved people could, for the first time, freely construct for themselves the structure of their day to day lives within the confines of the interests of the United States government. By the authority of the Treasury Act of July 13, 1861, the United States government could seize and sell enemy property to finance the war effort and in Beaufort, the most valuable enemy property was the vast quantities of abandoned cotton plantations as well as the potential to produce and sell more cotton in the future to fund the war effort. This gave Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P. Chase, immense influence which he wielded to restructure the socio-economic system in Beaufort to fund Union victory.\(^{41}\) Under the recommendations of Chase’s Treasury Department agents, General Thomas W. Sherman issued his General Field Orders Number 9 on February 6, 1862, that stated:

The helpless condition of the blacks inhabiting the vast area in the occupation…calls for immediate action…Adequate provision for the pressing necessities of this unfortunate and now interesting class of people…is now forced upon us…To relieve the Government of a burden that may hereafter become insupportable, and to enable the blacks to support and govern themselves…a suitable system of culture and instruction must be combined with one providing for their physical wants. Therefore, until proper legislation on the subject or until orders from higher authority, the country in occupation…will be divided off into districts of convenient size for proper superintendence.\(^{42}\)

Sherman’s orders were steeped in racist and paternalistic assumptions that the contraband population could not govern themselves, however, they created the legal authority by which the Port Royal Experiment could continue, and formerly enslaved people could continue to negotiate

---


their status in the experimental setting.43 Authorized by the Treasury Department, northern abolitionists, feminists, doctors, and teachers – all branded as missionaries – began arriving in Beaufort to aid in the creation of infrastructure that would re-shape formerly enslaved people’s lives.44 Of note is the establishment of Penn School, one of the earliest Port Royal Experiment schools that provided formal education to the formerly enslaved population but most importantly “enabled freed people to buy former plantation land at low prices” and build “their own financial independence.”45 In September 1862, President Lincoln issued the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation that declared that if the insurrectionary states did not return to the Union by January 1, 1863, “all persons held as slaves…shall be then…forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States…will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts or repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.”46 With that announcement, Lincoln legalized a new status for the formerly enslaved people considered contraband at the beginning of the war and now considered Freedmen. In Beaufort, Freedmen negotiated and advocated for themselves and their community to access new rights and ensure they would be protected as full citizens of the United States, all of which played out as part of the Port Royal Experiment.

United States Tax Commission

In addition to the Treasury Act of July 13, 1861, Congress passed the first federal income tax on August 5, 1861, titled: “An Act to provide increased revenue from imports, to pay interest on the public debt, and for other purposes” that authorized the federal government to collect twenty million dollars, divided amongst all the states, to further finance the war effort and facilitated by the United States Tax Commission. This act included the states that claimed to secede, resulting in South Carolina owing approximately $363,000 in taxes. Moreover, the federal government’s inclusion of these states made it clear that they not only rejected their claims of secession but found their allegiance to the Confederate States of America to be illegitimate. To further enumerate how the U.S. government would collect taxes in these states, Congress approved, “An act for the collection of direct taxes in insurrectionary districts within the United States and for other purposes” on June 7, 1862. By this act’s authority, U.S. tax commissioners set about collecting the twenty million dollars due the federal government, even in insurrectionary states, by placing value on all lands and property and assigning their apportioned taxes due. Three tax commissioners were assigned to Beaufort: Dr. William Henry Brisbane, Judge Abram D. Smith, and Judge William E. Wording. The act required that the commissioners place notices in local newspapers advertising the description of lands and their amount of taxes due as well as the time and location of a public auction where any property that

---

still owed taxes could be purchased by the “highest bidder.” In the event that taxes were not paid nor the land sold at auction, the property was foreclosed upon and the title transferred and held by the United States government. In Beaufort, advertisements were placed in *The Free South*, a Union military operated newspaper published in 1863 and 1864.

Perhaps what is most revolutionary about this piece of legislation and how it singularly reconstructed the course of history in Beaufort in particular, is who it specified could purchase property and therefore, become a landowner. Just three months before President Lincoln issued the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation which declared all enslaved people to be free and entitled to protection as Freedmen, the direct tax act for insurrectionary districts specified:

> Any loyal citizen of the United States, or any person, who shall have declared on oath his intention to become such, or any person who shall have faithfully served as an officer, musician, or private soldier or sailor in the army or navy or marine service of the United States, as a regular or volunteer, for the term of three months, may become the purchaser.

By specifically using the term “person,” the act liberally included the formerly enslaved population who were no longer slaves but who had not yet been legally defined as Freedmen. In Beaufort, where the formerly enslaved community was spearheading the creation of new rights for themselves and all formerly enslaved or free Black persons as part of the Port Royal Experiment, the act was transformative in that it empowered them to not only purchase property but to gain access to the rights associated with landownership in the United States. Furthermore, the specification of any “person” serving in the military seemingly anticipated the recruitment

---


and formation of troops composed of formerly enslaved and free Black people, extending purchasing power and associated rights to anyone who fought for the Union. In Beaufort, where the Port Royal Experiment enabled formerly enslaved people to access education programs, work for wages, and sustain themselves by growing their own food, the act for the collection of taxes in insurrectionary districts was a major success in that it codified a new right they could access and that would be protected by law: the ability to purchase and own land.

**United States Colored Troops**

On August 25, 1862, just two months after the tax act on insurrectionary districts passed, the War Department authorized military leaders in Beaufort to form the 1st South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, composed of “persons of African descent” who would be armed, uniformed, and equipped to serve in the United States military.\(^{53}\) It was a pivotal moment for the formerly enslaved people, who rightfully subscribed to famed abolitionist Frederick Douglass’ statement: “Once let the black man get upon his person the brass letter, U.S., let him get an eagle on his button, and a musket on his shoulder and bullets in his pocket, there is no power on earth that can deny that he has earned the right to citizenship.”\(^{54}\) In all of the progress made in the Port Royal Experiment in securing access to education, wages, and even the ability to purchase land as part of the provisions of the insurrectionary tax act, the decision to arm Black soldiers to protect and defend the Union of the United States was the most radical in that it, as Douglass is quoted, earns the right to citizenship. Though the unit was first known as the 1st Contraband Regiment, reflecting the ambiguous legal status of the formerly enslaved population, it was eventually re-

---


designated the 1st South Carolina Volunteer Infantry and then finally, the 33rd United States Colored Troops.\textsuperscript{55} Their courage was unmatched, with their Colonel, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, remarking in his journal: “There were more than a hundred men in the ranks who had voluntarily met more dangers in their escape from slavery than any of my young captains had incurred in all their lives.”\textsuperscript{56} By their bravery, the 1st South Carolina Volunteers not only proved their loyalty to the United States but established that formerly enslaved people were willing to fight for the freedom to purchase property, access education, receive payment for their work, and most of all, be protected as citizens of the United States, effectively ushering in reconstruction and all subsequent civil rights movements by the sword.

Reconstruction in Beaufort, South Carolina

\textit{Emancipation & the End of the Civil War}

Lincoln’s preliminary Emancipation Proclamation issued in September 1862 went into effect on January 1, 1863 in which “all persons held as slaves” were declared “forever free” and though it did not officially abolish slavery in the United States, it affirmed that the Civil War was fundamentally about obtaining freedom for enslaved people.\textsuperscript{57} The Civil War ended in April 1865 and the last people still enslaved were notified that they were free in June 1865 in Galveston, Texas.\textsuperscript{58} That same spring, the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, commonly known as the Freedmen’s Bureau, was established to “protect and educate

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
slaves freed by the military.” The government agency operated under the War Department from 1865 to 1872 with functions ranging from supervising “abandoned and confiscated property” to “issuing rations and clothing, operating hospitals and refugee camps, and supervising labor contracts between planters and freedpeople” with an overall mission to “help formerly enslaved people become self-sufficient.” By the end of the year, on December 6, 1865, Congress passed the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution which officially outlawed the practice of slavery and involuntary servitude. With the abolition of slavery, the work of reconstructing the nation officially began in which the United States re-negotiated, reconsidered, and reconstructed notions of citizenship, freedom, representation, and equality in the period now known as the Reconstruction era, lasting from 1861 to 1900.

A New Landscape: Socioeconomic & Physical Change in Postwar Beaufort

Beaufort’s population shifted from soldiers, missionaries, and Freedmen to a mix of soldiers who decided to stay in the area postwar, northerners looking to start businesses or found more schools and churches for Freedmen, the existing Gullah Geechee community and many Black refugees who travelled to Beaufort to access the resources established in the area for

62 It is necessary to note that the Thirteenth Amendment did not absolutely abolish the practice of slavery or involuntary servitude in that it allowed both to be legally practiced and protected as a punishment for crime. White former enslavers used this loophole to “funnel Black people into the convict leasing system” to replace “the labor force lost as a result of emancipation.” Following the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, laws were passed at the local level throughout the American South which created strict rules and regulations for Black people so that they could be arrested, incarcerated, and sent to prison where they were forced to perform labor in similar or worse conditions than during enslavement (if they were formerly enslaved). Clint Smith, How the Word is Passed (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2021). See Michelle Alexander’s book, The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness (2010), or Thomas Aiello’s book, Jim Crow’s Last Stand: Nonunanimous Criminal Jury Verdicts in Louisiana (2015) to learn more about government-protected policies which mimic the institution of slavery to continue attempts to control Black bodies in the U.S.

Some rebellious Beaufortonians who fled the city upon Union occupation returned as well to a completely different landscape. Not only was the city overrun with northerners, but the people they had once enslaved now freely attended schools and churches, were marrying, and reuniting with family members, and were purchasing land and building their own homes and agricultural enterprises, thus completely upending the Antebellum socio-economic system. Furthermore, the physical landscape was changed, too. Under the proceedings of the Direct Tax Commission, rebels lost claim to their land, homes, and plantations because they did not pay their taxes and most of that property was completely divided up and sold during and immediately after the war, altering Beaufort’s landscape from one of vast plantations to generally smaller landholdings distributed amongst mostly northern speculators but some Freedmen.\footnote{Stephen R. Wise, Alexander Moore, Gerhard Spieler, Lawrence Sanders Rowland, \textit{Rebellion, Reconstruction, and Redemption, 1861–1893 The History of Beaufort County, South Carolina: Volume 2, 1861-1893} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2015), 253-259.}

\textit{Violence and Reconstruction}

Though the Reconstruction era did lay the foundation for all Civil Rights protections for all people in the United States, it was not readily accepted; in fact, Black people were subject to all forms of violence as they did the work of reconstructing the nation after the Civil War. Throughout the Reconstruction era in Beaufort, violence against Black people was never far away and it manifested in various forms despite Civil Rights legislation such as the Fourteenth Amendment passing, which established terms of U.S. citizenship and specifically promised to
provide equal protection to all persons.\textsuperscript{65} Physical violence in the form of lynchings, assault, and other terrorist tactics led by individuals and organizations were common but not the only violence Black people faced during Reconstruction.\textsuperscript{66} Legislation passed by the former Confederate states, now known as “Black Codes,” completely restricted and controlled the freedom of Black people.\textsuperscript{67} In addition to White Beaufort rebels inciting physical violence against Black people as well as passing violent legislation, many did all in their power to regain the land they lost during the Civil War. In some cases, returned rebels hired lawyers to undermine the validity of the direct tax commission’s sale of their land to formerly enslaved people to regain their old property.\textsuperscript{68} If land had not been sold at auction, rebels could even pay the minimum amount of taxes due and receive of certificate of redemption in which they regained title to their Antebellum landholding.\textsuperscript{69} Finally, in the form of economic violence, the United States passed legislation which “compensated the descendants of antebellum owners of sea island plantations for their losses as a consequence of the U.S. Direct Tax Act foreclosures” in 1892.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{65} The National Archives, “14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Civil Rights (1868),” Reviewed February 2022. \url{https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/14th-amendment}.
\textsuperscript{66} The physical violence faced by Black people during the Reconstruction era is an immense topic which deserves further attention. It is a necessary part of this story; however, it cannot be fully explored in this paper. To learn more, please visit the Equal Justice Initiative’s report, “Reconstruction in America: Racial Violence after the Civil War, 1865-1876,” that can be found on their website: \url{https://eji.org/report/reconstruction-in-america/}.
\textsuperscript{68} United States Supreme Court, \textit{Cases Argued and Adjudged in the Supreme Court of the United States, Volume 12} (New York: The Banks Law Publishing Co, 1909), 391-400. \url{https://www.google.com/books/edition/Cases_Argued_and_Adjudged_in_the_Supreme/IeMGAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0}.
Chapter 2 : Land Development History of 1313 Congress Street

Indigenous History, Colonization, & the Establishment of Beaufort

Archaeological excavations date indigenous habitation along the South Carolina coast as early as 10,000 B.C. and at the time the first European explorers arrived in the sixteenth century, complex civilizations existed amongst the following tribes that called present-day Beaufort home: the Hoya, Witcheough, Escamacu, Wimbee, Toupa, Mayon, Stalame, Combahee, Kussoh, Ashepoo, and Edisto. Pedro de Salazar first explored Beaufort in 1514 and Lucas de Vázquez de Ayllón, another Spanish explorer, first attempted to establish a South Carolina settlement in 1526. The colony failed, as did many other attempts by Spanish, French, and Scottish colonists, but once Charleston was settled by the British in 1670, Beaufort got its start not long after in 1711. Between first contact and Beaufort’s official establishment, the relationship between indigenous people and Europeans was primarily characterized by violent and extractive interactions that came to a head in April 1715 when the Yamassee Indian War erupted.

The Yamassee War resulted in the expulsion of all indigenous people from Beaufort and the colonial era ramped up as settlers and the people they enslaved were brought in droves to transform the coastal landscape into one of large, profitable plantations. The colonial period ended when the American Revolution began in 1776. Though Beaufort was devasted by British forces during the Revolutionary War, the city slowly continued to recover and re-establish the large plantations that had originally made South Carolina one of the wealthiest British colonies.

---

By 1790, the population was approximately 18,000 people, a number which more than doubled during the Antebellum period, peaking in 1860 at approximately 40,000 people on the eve of the Civil War.\(^{76}\) It is unknown who owned the land upon which the house at 1313 Congress sits or what they did with it between Beaufort’s founding in 1711 and the Antebellum period when records relating to it first appear. The town boundary did not even include the land until the early nineteenth century when the city’s northern boundary expanded to its current configuration.\(^{77}\) Despite the lack of specific evidence for this period, the land upon which the house at 1313 Congress sits today is part of the story of Beaufort’s landscape history and includes indigenous habitation, early colonial settlement, the Revolutionary period, and the establishment of the plantation economy that gave rise to the Antebellum period and culminated in the Civil War.

**Chain of Title**

When Federal Troops occupied Beaufort following the Battle of Port Royal Sound in November 1861 and established the Direct Tax Commission to facilitate tax collection in insurrectionary districts, the commissioners mapped and assessed all of Beaufort County, labelling the land where 1313 Congress is now located as Block 100 after imposing a rectilinear grid over the town’s geography. Block 100, like most city blocks in the town of Beaufort, is a square that is approximately two acres in size. It is in the northwest quadrant of the city.\(^{78}\)

---


\(^{77}\) Historic Beaufort Foundation, “If These Streets Could Talk,” Updated 2021, [https://historicbeaufort.org/if-these-streets-could-talk/](https://historicbeaufort.org/if-these-streets-could-talk/).

\(^{78}\) Plan of the City of Beaufort, S.C., as allotted by U.S. Tax Commissioners for the District of South Carolina, February 1863, [https://catalog.archives.gov/id/305619](https://catalog.archives.gov/id/305619).
William Avis Morcock

Prior to the Civil War, before Block 100 was Block 100, the land was owned by William Avis Morcock, a prominent Beaufort resident who endorsed the institution of slavery and thrived because of it during the Antebellum period. Morcock was born in Georgia in 1804 and is recorded as living in Beaufort as early as 1810 up until at least 1870.79 By 1880, he lived in Morgan County, Georgia where he died two years later in October 1882 and is buried.80 During his life in Beaufort, Morcock benefitted greatly from the institution of slavery. He himself grew up in a household that enslaved people but after his marriage to Susan Maria Aggnew in 1827,

his prospects and prominence increased.\textsuperscript{81} The 1830 Census listed twelve enslaved people in their newly formed household.\textsuperscript{82} By 1850, Morcock is recorded as a forty-six-year-old planter who enslaved thirty-one people.\textsuperscript{83} The 1860 Census records that he owned 460 acres of land that primarily produced sweet potatoes and corn and that he enslaved thirty-four people.\textsuperscript{84} In addition to agricultural production, Morcock owned a large mercantile business on Bay Street, the main downtown business corridor in Beaufort, that “included a dry goods stores, a steam-powered grist mill, and three cotton gins.”\textsuperscript{85} And through marriage to his wife, Susan Maria Aggnew, Morcock received title to land and a house situated on the Beaufort River from which he oversaw the White Hall Ferry service, the only publicly accessible transportation from Beaufort to the Sea Islands, and which brought considerable wealth and power to his family.\textsuperscript{86}

When the Civil War broke out in April 1861 at Fort Sumter, Morcock’s family aligned themselves with the Confederate cause to protect the institution of slavery. Morcock’s wife, Susan Aggnew, presided over the Beaufort Soldiers’ Relief Association formed to support Confederate soldiers and two of their sons enlisted and actively fought for the Confederacy.\textsuperscript{87} Morcock himself worked for the Confederate War Tax Office in the fifth collection district as an assessor.\textsuperscript{88} The family fled Beaufort in 1861 and resided in Allendale, an inland region of South Carolina that remained a Confederate stronghold throughout the Civil War. Susan Aggnew

\textsuperscript{81} U.S. Census Bureau, 1830, AncestryLibrary. https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/.
\textsuperscript{82} U.S. Census Bureau, 1830, AncestryLibrary. https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/.
\textsuperscript{83} U.S. Census Bureau, 1850, AncestryLibrary. https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/.
\textsuperscript{84} U.S. Census Bureau, 1860, AncestryLibrary. https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/.
\textsuperscript{85} Lawrence S. Rowland, Alexander Moore, George C. Rogers, The History of Beaufort County, South Carolina: Volume 1, 1514-1861 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 383.
Morcock’s death in 1862, covered by her obituary, reveals the family’s location during the Civil War as well as their feelings toward it: “Driven from her home by this invasion, her strong faith never wavered.” Though the family left Beaufort in 1861, Morcock was aware that his landholdings were at risk and in 1862, he filed a claim with the Confederate War and Treasury Departments to receive payment for the “losses” he “suffered” due to the “invasion of the state by the public enemy.” The losses he refers to include all property he held as of 1861 when the federal government took over Beaufort and Morcock and his family abandoned their holdings. It includes a description of “Lots in Beaufort” Morcock owned that likely refers to the lot of land that would be re-named Block 100 by assessors.

![Figure 2.2: Confederate Property File for Wm. A. Morcock, August 1862. Image Source: National Archives.](https://www.fold3.com/)

The document is part of Morcock’s “Citizens File,” a record that is part of a collection of documents originally “created or received by the Confederate War and Treasury departments” which were taken into custody by the United States War Department after the Civil War and re-labelled “Rebel Archives.” Morcock’s Confederate Citizens File sheds light on how the land was likely used during the Antebellum period. Morcock specified in his claim that he owned numerous animals associated with livestock and agricultural production, one lot of land devoted

---

89 “Obituary,” The Charleston Mercury, March 5, 1862. [https://www.newspapers.com/](https://www.newspapers.com/).
to agricultural production tools, one lot devoted to poultry, a “nearly new 6 horse power steam engine,” one lot full of carpenter tools, one lot of household and kitchen furniture, one “tract land about 450 acres & 3 miles from Beaufort,” as well as foodstuffs such as corn, peas, and sweet potatoes. Additionally, Morcock described eighteen people as part of his property lost due to the “invasion of the State by the public enemy.” His personal property listings indicate he likely utilized the land upon which 1313 Congress sits today for livestock grazing, agricultural production, or storage of associated tools – all managed by the people he enslaved.

Figure 2.3: Diagram of Block 100 Owner Pre-1861, William Avis Morcock. Illustration Source: Emily Varley.

**United States Government**

As previously noted, when the federal government re-gained control of Beaufort after the Battle of Port Royal, they were empowered by tax laws passed in 1861 and 1862 to claim

---


ownership of all lands in Beaufort due to unpaid taxes. Under the Direct Tax Commission, they managed said lands by mapping, assessing, and eventually putting them up for sale to raise funds for the federal government and Union victory in the Civil War. In January 1863, a local Union-operated newspaper, *The Free South*, published a notice summarizing the situation and indicating the date, time, and location where the sale of the lands would occur, as well as descriptions of and amount due for the land being auctioned. It states:

Notice is hereby given that the several Tracts or Lots of Land situated in the State of South Carolina, hereinafter described, have become forfeited to the United States by reason of the non-payment of the direct taxes charged thereon…and that same will be sold at public auction on the 11th day of February, A.D., 1863, at 10 o’clock A.M. of said day, at the office of the Direct Tax Commissioners under the said Acts for the State of South Carolina, in the Town of Beaufort…and that the sale of the same will be continued from day to day until all of said Lots and Tracts of Land are finally disposed of.

Figure 2.4: *The Free South*, “Sale of Lands.” January 17, 1863. Image Source: Library of Congress.


It is in this newspaper article that Block 100 is first recorded and described with its total amount due being one dollar and twenty cents. On February 11, 1863, Block 100 was put up for sale at public auction at the office of the Direct Tax Commission.

![Diagram of Block 100 Owner 1861-1864, United States Government. Illustration Source: Emily Varley.]

Figure 2.5: Diagram of Block 100 Owner 1861-1864, United States Government. Illustration Source: Emily Varley.

**Ferdinand Vandeveer Hayden**

In January 1864, *The Free South* reported Dr. F.A. Hayden as the purchaser of Block 100. Dr. Ferdinand Hayden was a Union Army surgeon who presided over Beaufort hospital number three from 1863 to 1864. He was born in Westfield, Massachusetts in 1829 and, after attending Oberlin College, graduated from Albany Medical College in 1853. When the Civil War broke out in 1861, he was working as a naturalist and surgeon on the Raynolds’ expedition.

---

of the Yellowstone and Missouri rivers. Hayden returned from the west, enlisted, and first worked as the Assistant Surgeon of Volunteers in a Philadelphia hospital, followed by his promotion to full Surgeon of Volunteers in Beaufort in February 1863. When the newspaper reported Hayden as the purchaser of Block 100, he was still stationed in Beaufort; However, he was re-appointed shortly thereafter to the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia, where he served as chief medical officer until the end of the Civil War in 1865. After the war, Hayden resumed his studies of the western territories of the United States and is credited with helping found Yellowstone National Park. He died on December 22, 1887.

Though Hayden was the reported purchaser in the local newspaper, there is no other evidence indicating that he finalized the purchase. No deed transaction has been located which proves Hayden purchased Block 100 and it is unclear why the newspaper reported him as the purchaser. There is evidence to suggest that he may have been connected to the land purchase, though, but likely in the capacity as a facilitator or friend. Two days after the newspaper reported Hayden as the purchaser, a deed transfer of Block 100 was finalized on February 1, 1864, to a Union army soldier named Daniel Simmons. Simmons, hospitalized in Beaufort for two months in 1863, may have met or known Hayden and asked the surgeon to help him purchase property at the auction held by the tax commissioners.

---


105 Army, Navy, or Marine Land Certificate No. 96 (Beaufort, SC, February 1864), microfilm. National Archives Record Group 58, Tax Sale Certificates 1-64, Army/Navy/Marine Certificates 1-132. Accessed at Heritage Library, Hilton Head, South Carolina 2022; Index to Army, Navy, and Marine Land Certificates District of Beaufort, Compiled by Heritage Library Volunteers, [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/f802c4d941f5e45ce4dc44/t/5db57b78c0f8675afbe293/1572206520133/armynavy++ALPHA++LAND+CERTIFICATES.xls+-2011.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/f802c4d941f5e45ce4dc44/t/5db57b78c0f8675afbe293/1572206520133/armynavy++ALPHA++LAND+CERTIFICATES.xls+-2011.pdf).

Daniel Simmons

Army, Navy, or Marine Land Certificate No. 96 certified the sale of Block 100 to Daniel Simmons “for the sum of one hundred and sixty dollars,” of which one-fourth was paid with the remainder due over a period of three years. Per the regulations of the Direct Tax Act, the land certificate was “to be received...as prima facie evidence of the...validity of said sale, and of the title of said purchaser.” Simmons, formerly enslaved, was now a landowner.

Figure 2.6: Microfilm Image of Army, Navy, or Marine Certificate No. 96 Certifying the Sale of Block 100 to Daniel Simmons for the sum of $160 on February 1, 1864. Image Source: National Archives.


Daniel Simmons enlisted the year before he purchased Block 100, in April 1863, helping form the second all Black regiment in South Carolina known as the Second South Carolina Volunteer Infantry Regiment (Colored) and later known as the thirty-fourth United States Colored Infantry.  

His company’s descriptive book recorded Simmons as a private in company F who was twenty-seven years old, five feet six inches tall, with a “mulato” complexion and having black eyes and black hair. It lists his birthplace as Orangeburg, South Carolina, and his occupation as “Coach Maker.”

---


In February 1864, when the land certificate was finalized and Block 100 sold to Simmons, his company’s muster roll described him as “absent” with the note that he was “sick in Hospital Beaufort.”  

Simmons served in the army the remainder of the Civil War and mustered out in February 1866. It is unclear what Simmons did after the service, however, the next record in which he appears suggests that he chose to live on the land that he purchased in 1864. The 1880 Census recorded Daniel Simmons residing on Congress Street and was described as “Mu” for mulatto and his occupation as “Coach Painter,” aligning with earlier descriptions of Simmons.

---


and indicating that the soldier who purchased the land in 1864 built and lived in a house on Congress Street sometime between the purchase date and the census record in 1880.\textsuperscript{113}

According to the Beaufort County Assessor, the house at 1313 Congress Street was built in the year 1870, making it possible that Simmons constructed the house and lived in it, however, the 1880 Census does not indicate where exactly on Congress Street he lived, somewhat weakening his connection to the house at 1313 Congress Street specifically.\textsuperscript{114} It lists his dwelling number as “17” but it is unknown where on Congress Street dwelling seventeen was located as of the 1880 Census.\textsuperscript{115} Daniel Simmons was recorded as living in Beaufort in the 1890 Census.\textsuperscript{116} He died in August 1900 and is interred in the National Cemetery in Beaufort.\textsuperscript{117}

The next set of records associated with Block 100 indicate that at some point after Daniel Simmons purchased the land, he lost the title to it and ownership reverted to the United States Government. On June 30, 1874, a deed transaction was completed in which the United States released the title to Block 100 to W.A. Morcock, Trustee “for the sum of two dollars and eighty-five cents” under certificate of release number 147.\footnote{Beaufort County, South Carolina, Deed Book 19, Page 391, June 30, 1874 & October 31, 1893. \url{https://deedbooks.s3.amazonaws.com/Deed%20Book%20019.pdf}.}
Certificate of release documents were specifically created by an 1872 tax law to release lands “owned or held by the United States...under an act entitled ‘An act for the collection of direct taxes in insurrectionary districts’” back to original owners following the end of the Civil War.\(^{119}\) As the United States government released Block 100 to Morcock in 1874, it means that they held the title, indicating that at some point they reclaimed the title from Simmons. No records have been found indicating when this occurred, but it was likely in 1867, three years after Simmons’ initial purchase date and when the full amount was due for full ownership of the land.\(^{120}\)

Though the United States Government repossessed the title to Block 100 sometime between Simmons’ initial purchase date (1864) and when they released the title to Morcock (1874), this does not mean that Simmons did not reside on the land nor build the house at 1313 Congress Street. The 1872 tax law specifically included a stipulation describing scenarios where

[https://books.google.com/books?id=eyBAAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false].

\(^{120}\) Army, Navy, or Marine Land Certificate No. 96 (Beaufort, SC, February 1864), microfilm, National Archives Record Group 58, Tax Sale Certificates 1-64, Army/Navy/Marine Certificates 1-132. Accessed at Heritage Library, Hilton Head, SC, 2022.
people who improved lands whose titles were held by the government were due compensation
from the pre-war owner filing for the certificate of release: “If any person other than the
applicant shall…have made valuable and permanent improvements on the lands…after
acquisition of the title by the United States, and before June 8, 1872, it will be the duty of the
applicant for redemption to pay such person or persons the reasonable value of such permanent
improvement.”121 If Simmons lost title to Block 100 in 1867 but still improved the land in 1870
by building the house at 1313 Congress Street, he would have been entitled to a settlement from
Morcock at the time of redemption in 1874.122 No evidence has been found indicating that this
settlement occurred, however, Simmons’ presence on Congress Street in the 1880 Census is still
the strongest evidence that he remained living on Congress Street throughout this period,
regardless of holding title to the land.123 Moreover, the fact that the 1872 tax law included
direction for situations where a person improved land that they did not hold title to is evidence
that this was a common enough occurrence that they needed to account for it in the tax law.124
Whether Simmons resided on Block 100 or not, the title was held by the United States
Government by at least 1874.

121 United States, A Compilation of the Direct Tax Laws of the United States from August 5, 1861: with Regulations and


124 United States, A Compilation of the Direct Tax Laws of the United States from August 5, 1861: with Regulations and
William Avis Morcock

The 1874 Certificate of Release released the title to Block 100 from the United States Government to William Morcock, the owner of the land prior to the Civil War. The 1872 tax law which allowed for lands to be redeemed by previous owners included the stipulation that applicants must provide “satisfactory evidence” of their ownership to restore title to themselves. It is unclear exactly what evidence Morcock used to prove that he held title to Block 100 prior to the Civil War, however, the United States release to him indicates that it was sufficient to prove his ownership. He likely used personal documents such as the claim he filed with the Confederate War and Treasury Departments that did include a description of “4 Dwellings Houses & Lots in Beaufort” as part of his pre-Civil War property holdings.

---

It is unknown when exactly Morcock returned to Beaufort, however, in January 1867, the White Hall Ferry was rechartered “for the term of seven years…[to] William A. Morcock,” placing him back in Beaufort by 1867, following the end of the Civil War. He remained in Beaufort until at least 1874 to operate the ferry but by 1880 resided in Georgia where he died two years later. Morcock held title to Block 100 prior to the Civil War as well as briefly from 1874 to 1877 under the certificate of release. In 1877, he sold the land to Niels Christensen.

![Diagram of Block 100 Owner 1874-1877, William Avis Morcock](image)

Figure 2.13: Diagram of Block 100 Owner 1874-1877, William Avis Morcock. Illustration Source: Emily Varley.

**Niels Christensen**

Niels Christensen was born January 31, 1840, in Denmark and immigrated to the United States in 1862 to enlist and serve in the 145th Regiment of the New York Infantry to fight for the

---

Union Army during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{131} In a biography about his wife, historian Monica Maria Tetzlaff speculates that Christensen’s decision to immigrate and join the Union Army was partly due to it being his “best opportunity for advancement in the United States” as well as his “open attitude toward African Americans.”\textsuperscript{132} Tetzlaff's claim is informed by Christensen's time spent as Captain to the 44th U.S. Colored Infantry stationed in Alabama and Tennessee from 1865 to 1866 and which he achieved by passing an examination as opposed to being promoted based on local connections or social clout.\textsuperscript{133} He continued his service to the United States after the Civil War ended by working as the keeper of the National Cemetery in Beaufort from 1870 to 1876.\textsuperscript{134}


\textsuperscript{132} Monica Maria Tetzlaff, \textit{Cultivating a New South: Abbie Holmes Christensen and the Politics of Race and Gender} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002), 71.

\textsuperscript{133} Monica Maria Tetzlaff, \textit{Cultivating a New South: Abbie Holmes Christensen and the Politics of Race and Gender} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002), 72.

In 1874 he met Abbie Holmes, a missionary from Massachusetts in Beaufort to teach Freedmen, and in 1875 they married. A year later, in 1876, Christensen opened both “a lumber and hardware business” that sold “doors, sashes, blinds, flooring, nails, bricks, palmetto logs and cypress shingles” and the “Christensen Real Estate agency” in downtown Beaufort.

---

135 Monica Maria Tetzlaff, *Cultivating a New South: Abbie Holmes Christensen and the Politics of Race and Gender* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002), 73, 77.
By 1900, Christensen was “the largest taxpayer in Beaufort County.”\textsuperscript{137} He died in 1909 in Beaufort.\textsuperscript{138} A family biography explains Christensen’s success: After purchasing inexpensive land throughout Beaufort in the 1870s, Christensen began “building houses on credit” which he resold “mostly to African American families,” in which he “asked for no money down with only interest payments required.”\textsuperscript{139} The “small frame cottages” were financed and built by Christensen’s lumber company and title held by his real estate company until they could be paid


\textsuperscript{138} Find a Grave, “CPT Niels Christensen,” Accessed February 2023. https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/83548468/niels-christensen?_gl=1*jdu8cj*_ga*MTE3NDk1MDc5Ny4xNjg1OTk0MzQ1*_ga_4QT8FMEX30*MTY3NzE4NTMwOC4yMy4xLjE2NzcxODc5NTeuMTEuMC4w.

\textsuperscript{139} Unpublished papers related to Christensen Family, in the Christensen Family BDC Vertical File, undated, Beaufort District Collection, Beaufort County Library, Beaufort, South Carolina. Page 52, 81.
In some cases, the land and houses took “decades to pay off” with payments being made to Niels the 3rd, Christensen’s grandson, in the 1940s, as part of the family business.  

The deed transaction which transferred the title to Block 100 from Morcock to Christensen is dated January 9, 1877, though it also has a second associated date, November 1, 1893. The certificate of release from the United States government to Morcock also had a second associated date, October 31, 1893 – one day prior to Morcock selling Block 100 to Christensen.

It is likely that the documents were re-filed at the same time in 1893 at the

---


141 Unpublished papers related to Christensen Family, in the Christensen Family BDC Vertical File, undated, Beaufort District Collection, Beaufort County Library, Beaufort, South Carolina. Page 52.


request of Christensen as his name appears on both documents. Portions of the title to Block 100 remained in possession of the Christensen family until the 1940s when the family deeded their last held parcel of the block.

Before continuing the chain of title, it is necessary to note that though there is evidence suggesting Simmons constructed a house on Congress Street in Block 100 sometime between purchasing it in 1864 and his record of living on Congress Street in 1880, in combination with the Assessor construction date of 1870, there is also a possibility that the house was not built until Christensen purchased the land. If Christensen did with Block 100 as his family biography suggests was his pattern – purchasing land and constructing cottages for Black families to be paid off over several years – then it is possible that the house at 1313 Congress Street was not built until 1877. An 1877 construction date still accounts for Daniel Simmons residing on Congress Street in the 1880 Census. There is also conflicting evidence which suggests that another family resided in the house at 1313 Congress Street according to the 1880 Census. As later records refer to the house at 1313 Congress Street with an address listing of “422 Congress Street,” it is possible that Isaac Williams lived with his wife, “Rebec” and their five children. As later records refer to the house at 1313 Congress Street with an address listing of “422 Congress Street,” it is possible that Isaac Williams resided in the house as of the 1880 Census recording. Isaac Williams’ neighbors on the Census Page include Moses and Affie Simmons, known landholders in Block 100 according

---

to a later deed transaction, further indicating that the Williams family resided in the house at 1313 Congress Street at least in 1880.\(^{150}\) Little is known about Isaac Williams or how long he and his family may have resided in Block 100 at 422 Congress Street.

![Figure 2.17: Diagram of Block 100 Owner 1877-1896. Illustration Source: Emily Varley.](https://deedbooks.s3.amazonaws.com/Deed%20Book%20021.pdf)

After purchasing Block 100 from Morcock in 1877, the Christensen family subdivided the land into separate parcels. The earliest known deed transaction which subdivided Block 100 occurred on June 30, 1896, when Christensen transferred the northwest corner of Block 100 to Cecelia Reddick.\(^{151}\) His son released the adjacent parcel to “Celia Riddick” on December 14, 1911.\(^{152}\) They continued subdividing Block 100 and selling portions of it up through the 1940s, including a 1925 release from Christensen to Ben Myers, a 1944 release from Christensen to Theresa Simmons Gantt, as well as two transactions releasing two separate parcels in the

---


\(^{152}\) Beaufort County, South Carolina, Deed Book 31, Page 421, December 14, 1911. [https://deedbooks.s3.amazonaws.com/Deed%20Book%20031.pdf](https://deedbooks.s3.amazonaws.com/Deed%20Book%20031.pdf); I am assuming that Cecelia Reddick and Celia Reddick are the same person.
southwest corner of Block 100 to Edith Stokes in 1945 and 1946.\textsuperscript{153} In addition to those landowners, another portion of Block 100 was held by Affie Simmons, and though it is unclear when the Christensen family released that parcel to her, it is known that Simmons released it to her daughter, Rina Gregory, on April 7, 1904.\textsuperscript{154} The subdivision of Block 100 reveals the development history of the land, offers insight on Christensen’s business enterprises, and sheds light on who came to be the neighbors to the house at 1313 Congress Street over the years. Most of all, the deed transactions lead to the longest known owner of the house at 1313 Congress Street, Edith Stokes. It cannot be stated with certainty that Daniel Simmons constructed the house at 1313 Congress Street, nor can it be known exactly what year the house was constructed. It is known that Edith Stokes resided at 1313 Congress the longest and that the Christensen family played a significant role in the development of Block 100.


Figure 2.18: Known Subdivisions of Block 100 sold by Niels Christensen from 1896 to 1946. *Earliest known deed transfers, unknown if/when Christensen held these parcels. Data Source: Beaufort County Deed Books. Illustration Source: Emily Varley.

**Edith Stokes**

On January 12, 1945, N. Christensen Sons Company transferred the title to a portion of Block 100 to Edith Stokes. The heirs of Edith Stokes retain the title to the portion of Block 100 where the house at 1313 Congress sits today and she is the longest known resident of the house. Edith Stokes was born in Hampton County, South Carolina to Simon and Hagar Myers in 1862. The 1880 Census lists Edith as “Eady Myers” residing with her parents and siblings in Peeples, South Carolina, her occupation as “Field Hand” and unable to read or write. It

---


estimates her father’s birthdate to be around 1837 and her mother’s birthdate to be around 1835.\textsuperscript{158} Edith married her husband Gadson Stokes in 1890 and they remained living in Peeples, Hampton County, South Carolina until at least 1900. By that point, the couple had four children: James (b.1890), Rosalie (b.1892), Eliza (b.1894) Bertha (b.1895), and Sam (b.1898).\textsuperscript{159} Between 1900 and 1910, the family moved to Beaufort and listed three more children as part of their family: Lilly (b.1903), Zettie [Sadie] (b.1906), and Jessie (b.1908).\textsuperscript{160} The 1920 Census records the family as living on Congress Street as follows: Gadson Stokes (Head), Edy Stokes (Wife), Sam Stokes (Son), Lillie Stokes (Daughter), Sadie Stokes (Daughter), Booker T Stokes (Son) and indicates that the family rented their house.\textsuperscript{161} By 1930, Edith Stokes is recorded as the head of her household on Congress Street and living with her sons, Sam and Booker T, as well as with her daughter in law, Mamie Stokes.\textsuperscript{162} The 1940 Census again describes Edith Stokes as living on Congress Street and owning her home.\textsuperscript{163} The other members of her household listed are James, her son, and Rosalie, her granddaughter. In 1950, Edith Stokes still resided on Congress Street, though officially her complete address was listed as 1313 Congress in the Census.\textsuperscript{164} Her house was not always numbered 1313, records as late as 1940 describe Edith Stokes living at 422 Congress Street.\textsuperscript{165} 1952 and 1958 edits to a 1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map include both addresses.\textsuperscript{166} By 1950, Edith Stokes owned the


66
lot in the southwest corner of Block 100 where the house at 1313 Congress is located as well as the lot adjacent to it. She remained living in the house until her death in February 1967.

Figure 2.19: 1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map with 1952 & 1958 Edits showing Block 100. Image Source: University of South Carolina Digital Collections.

---

Chapter 3: Social History of the Stokes Cottage

The Story of the Stokes Cottage is the Story of Edith Stokes

The earliest known records which specifically reference the house at 1313 Congress Street appear in the 1950 Census when Edith Stokes is listed as the head of her household and living alone. Stokes lived in the house at 1313 Congress Street much earlier than 1950 and is the longest known resident of the house, therefore, the story of the house is incomplete without the story of Edith Stokes. On February 26, 1967, Edith Myers Stokes died at her home at 1313 Congress Street. She is buried at Pilgrim Cemetery in Burton, South Carolina and the funeral was managed by Wright-Donaldson. On the death certificate, her husband is listed as Gadson Stokes, her father is listed as Simon Myers, her mother as Hagar “?”, and her birthplace as Hampton County, South Carolina. The date of birth is “? - ? – 1896.” The informant is Sam Stokes, of Beaufort. Edith Myers Stokes’ death certificate hints at her overall life story and is the scaffolding by which I came to understand her, her family, and the community they formed surrounding the house at 1313 Congress Street. The house itself is remarkable for its long history, architectural significance, and place in Beaufort’s National Historic Landmark District; however, the social world held by the house and the people who were born, lived, and died in it are central to understanding the larger significance of the house at 1313 Congress Street.

Edith Myers Stokes’ death certificate estimates her birth to be in the year 1896, though evidence indicates she was born much earlier, likely in the 1860s. The 1880 Census records an “Eady Myers” living in the township of Peeples, in Hampton County, South Carolina with parents, Simon and Hagar Myers, and siblings, Tamah, Sawney, Benjamin, Patsey, Simon, and Hagar. She is described as “B” for Black and “F” for female and is recorded as being fifteen years old, indicative of an 1865 birth year.\textsuperscript{170} It is hard to imagine what life was like for a fifteen-year-old Black girl in rural South Carolina in 1880 nor will it ever really be possible to know

\textsuperscript{170} U.S. Census Bureau, 1880 Census, AncestryLibrary. \url{https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/}. 

Figure 3.1: 1313 Congress Street, Beaufort, SC. View Northwest. Image Source: Emily Varley, August 2022.
exactly what Edith Myers Stokes’ early life was like, but it is possible to describe the history of the socio-cultural landscape in which she lived and narrate how she came to be part of the story of the house at 1313 Congress Street.

When Edith Myers Stokes was born, Hampton County – her place of birth – did not even exist. In 1865, it was part of the mainland area of Beaufort County – the inland region connected to the rest of South Carolina rather than the coast and sea islands immediately surrounding the town of Beaufort itself. During the Civil War, the antebellum families who owned the vast agricultural plantations that characterized mainland Beaufort County did not lose their land and many returned home following the Civil War with hopes of recreating their old way of life through tenant farming and oppressive and strict Black Codes to control the people they formerly enslaved. In the 1870s, the population of this region was nearly 50% White and continued to adamantly vote Democrat standing in stark contrast to the population of the town of Beaufort and surrounding sea islands, with its 90% Black population that almost entirely voted Republican. In the inland region, Democratic voters supported oppressive and discriminatory policies that would control and disenfranchise Black people and on the coast and sea islands surrounding the town of Beaufort itself, Republican voters (the majority of which were Black) primarily supported radical reformations to support formerly enslaved people. This created a division between the inland and coastal regions of the counties and throughout the rest of the 1860s and 1870s, White leaders of the inland region of Beaufort County gathered support for a split of Beaufort County into two separate municipalities: Beaufort and Hampton Counties. The


campaign was a success and on February 28, 1878, South Carolina Governor Wade Hampton
signed a bill into law that officially split Beaufort County in two – an arbitrary geographic divide
reflective of political differences. The “secession” of Hampton County was seen by many as a
not-so-veiled attempt to recreate the power dynamics of the pre-Civil War Antebellum south
resulting in “difficult and even dangerous” conditions for local Black families now considered
residents of Hampton County.

According to the 1880 Census, Edith Myers was a fifteen-year-old “field hand” who
could neither read nor write. Her mother and four of her six siblings were also described as “field
hand[s],” with her eight-year-old sister, Patsey, being the youngest farm worker. Her father’s
occupation was “farmer.” The Census entry does not indicate whether Simon Myers owned his
farm or if he, his wife, and children worked on a farm that they rented for either shares of the

products (sharecropping) or for a fixed amount of money (tenant farming) or if they owned and operated their own farm. According to an analysis of 1880 Census data of the “Cotton South” states of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Texas, and South Carolina, 54.6% of Black-operated farms were sharecropped, 25.8% were fixed-rented, and 19.6% were owned, making it likely that the Myers family either sharecropped or paid rent to operate their farm.176 How crops were controlled in the years following the Civil War was a divisive Reconstruction era issue. For formerly enslaved people, like Edith’s parents, they were intimately familiar with farming and experts of the local landscape and often felt entitled to own both the land and crops that their labor (and their ancestors’ labor) had created. On the other hand, former plantation owners wanted to continue to reap the most profit they could from the large swaths of land they owned. Sharecropping and tenant farming became common ways the plantation farming system was reconstructed to include formerly enslaved people, though the former is recognized as much more exploitative and therefore, favored by former plantation owners and disdained by formerly enslaved people. This trend is visible in the 1880 Census differences between Beaufort County, with its 91% Black population, and Hampton County, with its 66% Black population.177 In Beaufort County, 51% of farms were rented with only 1% sharecropped and in Hampton County, 17% of farms were rented and 19% were sharecropped.178 Regardless of ownership structure and the larger historical narrative reflected in that status, it must also be noted that Edith Myers’ upbringing on a farm gave her a remarkable knowledge of how to provide for herself and her family in the form of crop production.

178 Total Number of Farms, Owner Operated Farms, Farms Rented for Shares of Products, 1880, Social Explorer, (based on data from U.S. Census Bureau; accessed March 2023), https://www.socialexplorer.com/ad1002be4e/view.
According to the 1900 Census, Simon Myers still lived and worked as a farmer in Hampton County with his wife and children described as “farm laborers,” though Edith Myers was now listed in the Census as Edith Stokes, as she had married her husband, Gadson Stokes, in 1890. The 1900 Census records Gadson and Edith Stokes living in Hampton County with their five children: James (born: 1890), Rosa Lee [“Rosalie”] (born: 1892), Eliza (born: 1894), Bertha (born: 1895), and Sam (born: 1898). Gadson was described as a “farmer” who rented his home, Edith had no occupation listed, and the Census indicated that both could read, write, and speak English – a notable change from the 1880 Census that had listed Edith as unable to read or write. Like the early part of her life, it is impossible to know exactly what life was like for Edith as a young woman, newlywed, and mother of five young children in the years between her appearance in the 1880 and 1900 Censuses. Historically, Edith Myers Stokes would have been experiencing these stages of her life as the Reconstruction Era (1863 – 1877) ended and White southern Democrats regained power and used it to oppress and disenfranchise Black people. From the moment the Civil War ended, White southern Democrats had been steadily regaining political power throughout South Carolina with Beaufort being one of the last counties to continue to elect Black and Republican leaders that defended and protected equal rights for Black people up through the 1890s. Growing up herself in Hampton County as well as raising her young children there, Stokes would have been painfully aware of the legally oppressive Black Codes as well as the violence of illegal terrorist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan.

In the years following the split of Beaufort and Hampton County, many Black families migrated to Beaufort County to access land ownership and formal education so they might continue the work of Reconstruction in their own lives for themselves and their families. Both the Myers and the Stokes family remained in Hampton County until at least 1900 though they too followed the trend and eventually migrated to Beaufort County sometime between 1900 and 1910.\textsuperscript{182} The 1910 Census does not indicate where in Beaufort the family lived, but it is believed that they resided in the house at 1313 Congress Street.\textsuperscript{183} The 1910 Census records Edith living in the city of Beaufort with her husband, Gadson, and their children: James (age: eighteen), Rosa Lee (age: sixteen), Eliza (age: fourteen), Bertha (age: twelve), Samuel (age: ten), Lilly (age: seven), Sadie [“Zettie”] (age: four), and Jessie (age: two). Gadson’s occupation was described as “Farmer,” his industry as “Home Farm,” and his home as “R” for rented. Edith Stokes was described as “F” for female, “Mu” for mulatto, age thirty-five, with “none” written for occupation. In addition to asking if persons could read and write, the Census asked if a person had attended school. Edith and Gadson were described as able to read and write but their school attendance column was blank. All their children, apart from the youngest – four-year-old Sadie and two-year-old Jessie – were also able to read and write in addition to receiving a “yes” in their school attendance columns.\textsuperscript{184} Gadson’s title of “Farmer” and industry description of “Home Farm” indicates a measure of self-supporting independence the family achieved once in Beaufort. According to the 1910 Census instructions for enumerators, a farmer is “a person in

\textsuperscript{182} 1900 Census, AncestryLibrary. \url{https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/}; 1910 Census, AncestryLibrary. \url{https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/}

\textsuperscript{183} This theory that the Stokes family lived at the house on Congress Street by the 1910 Census records comes from an oral history interview with two of Edith Stokes’ descendants, granddaughters Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes.

\textsuperscript{184} 1910 Census, AncestryLibrary. \url{https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/}
charge of a farm…whether he owns it or operates it as a tenant, renter, or cropper,,” and a home farm is defined under the “Women doing farm work” section as “a woman working regularly at outdoor farm work…on the home farm for her husband, son, or other relative.” This indicates that Edith’s family likely lived independently by providing for themselves with their home farm, even if they did rent the land itself or share the crop yield with an owner. Moreover, Edith’s children were described as attending school rather than as “field hands,” as she and her siblings had been when they were children. Life would have still been difficult but these small changes in their circumstances indicate that their family actively reconstructed their lives and life outcomes through their home farm that brought independence and self-sufficiency and their commitment to educating their children.

It is unknown where Edith’s children attended school while living in Beaufort though their options would have been limited to the segregated public schools managed by the school district or one of the schools originally founded during the Port Royal Experiment for the education of formerly enslaved people. Of the schools founded during the Civil War and the Reconstruction Era, there was Penn School, Mather School, Port Royal Agricultural School, Harbison Institute, and likely others. Penn School began in June 1862 when northern activists Laura Towne and Ellen Murray first instructed formerly enslaved pupils at Oaks Plantation on St. Helena Island, then, outgrowing that site, they moved operations to nearby Brick Church, and finally they established their own campus, now known as Penn Center, on land they purchased.

185 The 1910 Census Enumerator Instructions indicates that a “home farm” regardless of whether it is rented, sharecropped, or occupied by tenants is a farm operated by a head of household where the family lives indicating that the Stokes family lived on their own private home farm they were in charge of, even if they rented it from a landowner. U.S. Census Bureau, “1910 Census Instructions to Enumerators,” 1910, https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/technical-documentation/questionnaires/1910/1910-instructions.html.
from freedman, Hastings Gantt.\textsuperscript{187} Penn educated Black students until 1948 when the school transitioned to a community center and Civil Rights Movement advocacy outpost.\textsuperscript{188} Mather School was founded by Rachel Crane Mather of Boston in 1868 to provide an education for formerly enslaved women and their daughters on Port Royal Island. The school educated students until 1968 when it became a trade school managed by the state and now the site of the Technical College of the Lowcountry.\textsuperscript{189} Port Royal Agricultural School, later known as Shanklin School, was founded in 1901 on Port Royal Island by Abbie Holmes Christensen, a Massachusetts native who had come to Beaufort at a young age to participate in the Port Royal Experiment with her parents.\textsuperscript{190} Shanklin School, though officially titled “Beaufort County Training School” after a 1920 name and ownership change, was run by Tuskegee graduates Joseph Shanklin and India Gordon Shanklin from 1903 to 1946 (Joseph) and 1905 to 1939 (India).\textsuperscript{191} The school closed in 1955.\textsuperscript{192} Little is known about Harbison Institute other than its location in the town of Beaufort itself according to fire insurance maps that mark its presence at the southwest corner of Prince and Scott Street in 1899 and 1905, as well as in 1912 with a name

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{191} University of South Carolina, “Shanklin Family Papers,” Accessed March 2023. \url{https://archives.library.sc.edu/repositories/3/resources/58}.
\end{flushright}
change to “Beaufort Academy (Negro).” The school presumably closed when the building became apartments sometime between the 1924 and 1958 fire insurance survey of the town.

Though it would have been possible for Edith Stokes’ children to attend school at any of those locations, Mather School, Shanklin School, and Harbison Institute were geographically much closer to their home on Congress Street being on the same island (Port Royal) that the city of Beaufort itself is located on, as opposed to Penn School which is located on St. Helena Island, across the Beaufort River. In addition to those options for schooling, Beaufort also had segregated public schools for Black students with one, “Public School Colored,” being only a few blocks from their home on Congress Street and occupying the city block north of Washington Street between Carteret Street and New Street.

I have chosen to include the term “Negro” in this thesis as it part of the historical record and, though it is harmful and was used historically to discriminate against Black people, I do not wish to exclude it or ignore the racist history of Beaufort, South Carolina nor ignore the discrimination that the family at the center of this thesis would have dealt with living in Beaufort. It is not intended to be harmful in any way.


I have chosen to include the term “Colored” in this thesis as it part of the
It likely opened following the *Plessy v. Ferguson* Supreme Court Case decision of 1896 that allowed for “equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races,” though it does not appear on local surveys of the city until 1905.\(^\text{196}\) By 1920, Beaufort public schools were spending $31.48 per White student and only $3.69 per Black student, illustrating the blatant racism and discrimination prevalent in Beaufort and the larger education system.\(^\text{197}\) Despite the discrimination they would have faced, whether attending one of the schools founded during the historical record and, though it is harmful and was used historically to discriminate against Black people, I do not wish to exclude it or ignore the racist history of Beaufort, South Carolina nor ignore the discrimination that the family at the center of this thesis would have dealt with living in Beaufort. It is not intended to be harmful in any way.


Civil War and Reconstruction Era or the local public school, Edith Stokes’ children attended school, effectively reconstructing their lives by doing what their parents had been unable to and what their grandparents, enslaved people, would have been barred from doing.

The 1920 Census records Edith and Gadson Stokes living in Beaufort with some of their older children, including their youngest, Booker T. (age: eleven). It also indicates that the family lived at 422 Congress Street. This address no longer exists but it is believed that it is referring to the house at 1313 Congress Street. By this point, Edith Stokes’ family network in Beaufort also expanded. Her father, Simon Myers, is recorded as living in Beaufort on Boundary Street, making his home just one street north of the Stokes family home on Congress Street and possibly in the same block. Her brother, Ben Myers, also relocated from Hampton to Beaufort County and is recorded as living on Boundary Street as well. Ben Myers’ home location is known to be in Block 100, just northeast of the house at 1313 Congress Street, because he purchased the land it sits upon in 1925. Additionally, an oral history interview with Edith Stokes’ granddaughters’ Annie Mae and Shirley fondly recalled what it was like growing up and going to visit “Uncle Ben” at his home just behind their grandmother’s house at 1313 Congress Street. While Edith’s family drew together in Beaufort, their migration into Beaufort stands in stark contrast to the larger historical migration which occurred during this period out of Beaufort and out of all southern states. From the 1910s through the 1970s, “some six million Black southerners left the

---

199 This theory that the Stokes family lived at the house on Congress Street by the 1910 Census and especially by the 1920 Census comes from an oral history interview with two of Edith Stokes’ descendants, granddaughters Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes. Additionally, the 1920 Census page for Gadson and Edith includes two neighbors that can be linked to Block 100 (the location of the house at 1313 Congress Street) via deed transfer documents: Ben Myers is recorded on Boundary Street and purchased land in Block 100 in 1925 and Affie Simmons is recorded on Congress Street and transferred her title to land in Block 100 to her daughter in 1904. [1920 Census, AncestryLibrary.](https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/).
200 Ben Myers’ home location is known to be in Block 100, just northeast of the house at 1313 Congress Street, because he purchased the land it sits upon in 1925. Additionally, an oral history interview with Edith Stokes’ granddaughters’ Annie Mae and Shirley fondly recalled what it was like growing up and going to visit “Uncle Ben” at his home just behind their grandmother’s house at 1313 Congress Street. [Beaufort County, South Carolina, Deed Book 44, Page 195, February 2, 1925.](https://deedbooks.s3.amazonaws.com/Deed%20Book%20044.pdf)
201 Annie Mae & Shirley Stokes, interview by Emily Varley, Beaufort, South Carolina, July 27, 2022.
land of their forefathers and fanned out across the country for an uncertain existence in nearly every other corner of America,” now known as the Great Migration. Beaufort was no different with the total Black population dropping nearly 50% from 32,137 persons in 1900 to 17,454 in 1920. Despite Edith likely watching her friends, some of her family, and community members leave Beaufort in search of new opportunities elsewhere, she chose to stay and continue building a life there for herself and her family. In addition to growing her community by investing in her children’s education by sending them to school and having relatives move to Beaufort to be nearby, Edith was a long-time congregant of Central Baptist Church in Beaufort.

The 1930 Census records Edith Stokes living at 422 Congress Street in Beaufort with her sons, Sam, and Booker T., as well as with her daughter-in-law, Mamie – Sam’s wife. Ben Myers, her brother, is recorded on the same page as Edith as he still lived on Boundary Street, on one of the lots behind her house on Congress Street. Edith’s father no longer lived nearby as he died in June 1922 at age eighty. Edith supplied the information for the death certificate. The 1930 Census reveals that Edith suffered another loss between 1920 and 1930 as it records her as a widow, indicating that her husband Gadson Stokes passed away sometime in the 1920s. In other ways, Edith’s life seemed to improve. She is described as owning her home, valued at $250, as well as being described as the owner of her own farm. Her occupation is “Farmer.” It is unclear why Edith Stokes reported that she owned her home and farm in the 1930 Census as

204 Annie Mae & Shirley Stokes, interview by Emily Varley, Beaufort, South Carolina, July 27, 2022.
titles to land ownership were not officially transferred to her until 1945 and 1946; Nevertheless, it is possible that she had paid off the majority of what was due and simply did not finalize the legal documents until later. With her youngest son, Booker T., recorded as eighteen years old in 1930 and soon to be married and starting his own family, Edith’s life transitioned into that of a family matriarch and grandmother.210

The 1940 Census records Edith Stokes living on Congress Street, surrounded by her family. Her occupation was still described as farmer, despite being recorded as sixty-nine years old, and likely being closer to her mid-seventies.211 Her brother, Ben Myers, and his wife, Minnie, still lived in the house behind hers on the same block.212 Her son, Sam, and his wife, Mamie, lived on Congress Street as did her youngest son, Booker T. [“Bookatie”] with his wife, Annie Mae, and their children. Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, Edith’s family grew to include many grandchildren. Sam and Mamie had one daughter, Geraldine (born: 1940).213 Booker T. and Annie Mae had multiple children: Booker T. Jr. (born: 1932), Sammie (born: 1934), Leroy (born: 1936), Annie Mae (born: 1938), Jackson (born: 1941), Carolyn (born: 1943), Bernard (born: 1945), Ralph (born: 1947), Shirley (born: 1949), and Cynthia (born: 1956).214 Though

211 1940 Census, AncestryLibrary. https://www.ancestrylibrary.com/; The 1880 Census listed Edith’s age as 15 in 1880, placing her birth year in 1865, which would make her 75 years old in 1940.
Edith’s other children also gave her grandchildren, Sam and Booker T. raised their children in Beaufort, and, in the case of Booker T.’s first four children, they were born in the house at 1313 Congress Street. They moved into their own home down the street, at 1401 Washington Street, in the 1940s. In addition to her family growing, Edith Stokes’ assets grew in the 1940s. On January 12, 1945, Edith Stokes received title to the land where the house at 1313 Congress sits from N. Christensen Sons Company, officially making her the owner of the house and the lot where it is situated. A year later, on December 30, 1946, Edith Stokes received title to the adjacent parcel from N. Christensen Sons Company, likely the land considered part of her “farm” reported in earlier census records and recalled by her granddaughter, Annie Mae, in an interview. By the 1950 Census, Edith Stokes is recorded as living alone at 1313 Congress Street. Though her census form was largely left blank, her life story from 1950 onward to her death in 1967 is illuminated by the memories of her granddaughters, Annie Mae, and Shirley Stokes.

1950 to 1967

On July 27, 2022, Annie Mae Stokes recalled what her life was like growing up in Beaufort and shared memories of her grandmother, Edith Stokes, from the time she was born in 1938 until her grandmother’s passing in 1967. One of the first things she mentioned is that she was born in her grandmother’s house at 1313 Congress Street, according to her own mother.

---

Annie Mae Green Stokes.\textsuperscript{219} She described how her grandmother, mother, father, and siblings made growing up very pleasant for her and that her grandmother would give her gifts such as making her pancakes or buying her a baby doll. She described how she would run down to her grandmother’s house when her mother sent her outside to do chores growing up. Annie Mae considers both 1313 Congress Street (her grandmother’s home) and 1401 Washington (her parent’s home) her home as she spent considerable time in both and both homes remain within her family. And when running down to her grandmother’s house, Annie Mae recalled that she would stop along the way and wait under the shade of the trees to cool her feet since she often did not wear shoes and the streets were not yet paved and it was hot – despite her home at 1401 Washington Street only being two blocks away from her grandmother’s house. Occasionally, Annie Mae recalled, that her brother would even take their father’s horse (which he kept at their home on Washington Street and that the family grew up with until local zoning laws changed to prohibit livestock in residential areas) and ride it to their grandmother’s house.\textsuperscript{220} One of her brothers would be in the front, Annie Mae in the middle, and another brother behind her and the three would ride to their grandmother’s house. Annie Mae recalled her grandmother saying to them, “Children, why are you riding your father’s horse down here in all this heat?” and they would reply, “Well, Grandma its very hot out!” And so, Edith Stokes told them to go and tie the horse around the back of her house and pump some water from the pump to give it a drink and

\textsuperscript{219} Annie Mae’s mother is also named Annie Mae. Her maiden name “Green” is known from their family’s 1950 Census record which includes “Sarah Green” in their household and is described as “Mother-in-law” to the head of household, Booker T. Stokes, Annie Mae’s husband and the informant’s father. Annie Mae’s mother filled out Sarah Green’s death certificate in 1955. 

\textsuperscript{220} The record of a zoning law change has not been confirmed but Annie Mae recalled that the laws changed, and they had to take the horse out to their country property because it was no longer permitted to be at their house in town. Additionally, the law change resulted in the removal of an outhouse in the backyard of Edith Stokes’ house on Congress Street as well as an addition being constructed at the rear of the house to create an indoor bathroom and more substantial kitchen space.
cool it off. She remembered it was her brothers’ way of having a “little fun” with grandmother because “she was very, very funny.”

Annie Mae also described what she remembers about her grandmother’s house and yard. In addition to the water pump in the front of the house, there was a fence at the front of the yard to keep her animals and crops protected. Annie Mae remembers when she would go to the front gate at her grandmother’s house and the rooster would be there “like a dog” and would not let her into the yard. Edith Stokes would get a broom and tell the rooster, “Go to the back, go to the back!” and it would listen to her. But Annie Mae recalls, the rooster was pretending, and he would go “through the kitchen door to the back and come to the front.” He didn’t want them in the yard so her grandmother would have to lock him up in the chicken coop in the backyard. She also kept a cow and Annie Mae recalled that her grandmother would milk the cow “just about every day” so they would have fresh milk. She also grew crops in the fields adjacent to the house: peanuts, corn, and beans. Annie Mae remembers following behind her grandmother and learning how to pull up the peanuts, shake off the dirt, and then bring them home to pull the peanuts off the branches. Her grandmother’s garden was very nice and “People would come by, and she would even give peanuts and sometimes the beans…to people.”

In the later years of her life, Edith Stokes lost her eyesight and came to rely on her family and her community, though she continued to live independently in her home on Congress Street. Annie Mae recalls the neighbors coming to her aid to help her with harvests and especially one neighbor, a woman schoolteacher who helped her with reading. The “next-door lady…schoolteacher” recalled is likely Theresa Simmons-Gantt, who lived on nearby Harrington

---

221 Annie Mae & Shirley Stokes, interview by Emily Varley, Beaufort, South Carolina, July 27, 2022.
222 Annie Mae & Shirley Stokes, interview by Emily Varley, Beaufort, South Carolina, July 27, 2022.
223 Annie Mae & Shirley Stokes, interview by Emily Varley, Beaufort, South Carolina, July 27, 2022.
Street with her parents in 1940 when she was first recorded as a “teacher,” and who purchased the lot adjacent to Edith’s in 1944.\textsuperscript{224} Simmons-Gantt and her husband constructed their home at 1307 Congress Street the following year, 1945, where they lived as neighbors to Stokes for the remainder of their lives.\textsuperscript{225} Despite going blind, Shirley Stokes recalled, her grandmother was “very sharp.” When Edith went blind, it was often Shirley’s job to bring her grandmother breakfast, “always oatmeal,” that she would pick up at her uncle’s house, Sam, as her aunt, Mamie, made breakfast for Edith daily. When Shirley returned home from school each day, her mother, Annie Mae, had her deliver the dinner she made for her mother-in-law. Their family also helped Edith by taking her on Sundays to Central Baptist Church, where she was a long-time congregant.\textsuperscript{226} Edith Stokes died at her home on Congress Street on February 26, 1967.\textsuperscript{227}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Figure 3.5: Photograph from Oral History Interview. Interviewer Emily Varley (L) & Informant Annie Mae Stokes (R). Videography of Oral History Interview conducted by Paul Keyserling.}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{226} Annie Mae & Shirley Stokes, interview by Emily Varley, Beaufort, South Carolina, July 27, 2022. \\
\end{flushleft}
Post 1967

It is unclear who lived in the house at 1313 Congress Street in the years immediately following Edith Stokes’ death, but it is known that the house stayed within the Stokes family. Records indicate that legal proceedings to officially transfer the title to the land and house at 1313 Congress Street were not initiated until the 1990s. At that time, it is known that one of Edith’s grandson’s, Jackson, “Juggie,” Stokes lived in the house on Congress Street, but it is unclear for how long or if he lived with anyone else. The most recent deed transactions associated with the land and house at 1313 Congress Street were completed in 1994, following the death of Annie Mae Stokes Sr. in 1992. A deed of distribution divided ownership of 1313 Congress Street into eight parts, to each of Edith Stokes’ remaining grandchildren: Sammie, Leroy, Jackson, Ralph, Annie Mae, Carolyn, Cynthia, and Shirley. At present, in 2023, only Annie Mae, Cynthia, and Shirley are alive and hold title to the land and house at 1313 Congress Street.

---

228 Beaufort County, South Carolina, Deed Book 579, Pages 657-660, July 15, 1991. [https://rod.beaufortcountysc.gov/BrowserViewDMP/](https://rod.beaufortcountysc.gov/BrowserViewDMP/).
230 Beaufort County, South Carolina, Deed Book 678, Pages 1124-1127, January 13, 1994. [https://rod.beaufortcountysc.gov/BrowserViewDMP/](https://rod.beaufortcountysc.gov/BrowserViewDMP/).
231 This information is known by viewing the obituaries of Sammie Stokes, Leroy Stokes, Jackson Stokes, Ralph Stokes, and Carolyn Stokes. I met and interviewed Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes in July 2022.
Chapter 4: Reconstructing Preservation Practice

Preservation Law & Land Use Regulation

Federal Preservation Law & Land Use Regulation

The entirety of the original boundaries of the city of Beaufort (approximately 304 acres) was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1969 and then designated a National Historic Landmark District in 1973.\footnote{City of Beaufort, “Historic District,” Accessed April 2023. \url{https://www.cityofbeaufort.org/178/Historic-District.}}

![Figure 4.1: Beaufort National Historic Landmark District Map. Map Source: Emily Varley.](image)

The National Historic Landmark Program is authorized under the Historic Sites Act of 1935 to “preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the
The National Register of Historic Places is authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to create “a system of procedural protections” that “encourage both the identification and protection of historic resources.” Though Beaufort’s status first as a historic district in the National Register of Historic Places and then as a National Historic Landmark district means that the city is highly regarded and of national significance, these designations are nominal only. Neither the Historic Sites Act of 1935 nor the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 created a police power for the federal government to administer the treatments recommended by the National Park Service for conserving cultural heritage sites, structures, landscapes, objects, and places. The official treatments are preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction, however, cultural heritage is often altered, demolished, relocated, memorialized, interpreted, erased, or forgotten. Preservation practice in the United States is defined and mandated by the Historic Sites Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, policies which, for better or worse, limit the scope of preservation to official treatments and authorized interventions. Nonetheless, the establishment of the National Register of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmarks Program are both of vital importance as they draw attention to resources and can, as a result, inspire respect for, continued investment in, and awareness of cultural heritage in the United States.

---

The establishment of the National Register of Historic Places, though without the legal “teeth” necessary to enforce the conservation of cultural heritage, created a framework by which state, tribal, and local governing bodies could similarly create registers to acknowledge cultural heritage and use their more extensive governing power to enforce and incentivize conservation efforts via land use laws. In the United States, land use is typically regulated at the local level, and it is no different in South Carolina, where the site at the center of this investigation – 1313 Congress Street – is located. In South Carolina, the State Legislature or South Carolina General Assembly, has been granting counties and other local governing bodies the “authority to undertake planning activity” and “regulate the development of land” since at least the 1920s. In 1994, the South Carolina General Assembly or Legislature modernized this granted power by enacting the “Local Government Comprehensive Planning Enabling Act” to spell out exactly what power local governing bodies have over land use within their politically defined geographic boundaries. In South Carolina, the state does not keep a list of state-level historic resources, nor does it designate resources as historic at the state-level. Instead, the state delegates legal authority to local governing entities such as Beaufort County or the City of Beaufort to develop regulations pertaining to land use within their political jurisdictions, including the identification, designation, and regulation of historic resources.

Figure 4.2: Beaufort County, South Carolina County Boundary Map. Map Source: Emily Varley.

Figure 4.3: City of Beaufort, South Carolina Municipal Boundary Map. Map Source: Emily Varley.
Prior to the National Historic Sites Act in 1935 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, local jurisdictions used their power over land use to create rules, regulations, and protections specific to buildings and sites within their boundaries that they thought reflected their locality’s history, were threatened by demolition and economic development, or were being heavily altered and thus, no longer conveyed their history. By the authority of the City’s Planning and Zoning Commission, the city of Charleston, South Carolina passed the first zoning ordinance of its kind in October 1931 which regulated the exterior appearances of historic buildings within a designated historic district in Charleston. It set a precedent for community control and regulation of land use if a site or entire district is considered a resource to a community for its historic value.

City of Beaufort Preservation Law & Land Use Regulation

In Beaufort, under the city code chapter written to “establish an orderly process to develop land within the jurisdiction of the city of Beaufort,” is their “Historic Designation” section which outlines how and why sites, structures, or entire districts of the city might be designated as historic and how designation might affect the regulation of said sites, structures, or districts. The code further elaborates by establishing and explaining the development review governing body responsible for reviewing and taking action on projects within Beaufort’s Historic District – the Historic Review Board or HRB. When Beaufort was placed on the

---


240 Beaufort, South Carolina, the Beaufort Development Code, ch. 9 § 1, 11. (2023). https://library.municode.com/sc/beaufort/codes/the_beaufort_development_code.

National Register of Historic Places in 1968 and then became a National Historic Landmark District in 1973, it was – as previously mentioned – a nominal designation. Technically, the United States government has no authority beyond naming the city as historically significant to control how it develops or changes over time – that power is only held by the states. In this case, the state of South Carolina through the city of Beaufort’s zoning code chose to act upon the national designation and create local controls over the area by establishing a local Historic District which aligns with the National Historic Landmark District boundaries. As a result, the Historic Review Board exercises considerable power over the development of Beaufort as they are effectively in control of 300 acres of the city. The city code includes the documents, guidelines, and standards adopted for use by the HRB which informs their decision-making.\textsuperscript{242}

When visiting the city of Beaufort, one quickly realizes the benefits of strict local historic district guidelines as they have resulted in a picturesque, walkable, and an all-around mesmerizing built landscape that feels a bit like travelling to a different time in American history. The main commercial corridor, Bay Street, features attractive and meticulously preserved architecture such as the Robert Means House (circa 1800) or the John Mark Verdier House (circa 1801) as well as Beaufort specific historical elements like the exposed tabby wall at 715 Bay Street dated to 1760.\textsuperscript{243}

\textsuperscript{242} Beaufort, South Carolina, the Beaufort Development Code, ch. 9 § 10, (2023). \url{https://library.municode.com/sc/beaufort/codes/the_beaufort_development_code}. \textsuperscript{243} David B. Schneider, “Beaufort Historic District,” National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (Beaufort, SC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001), Section 7. \url{http://www.nationalregister.sc.gov/beaufort/S10817707001/S10817707001.pdf}; Tabby is a “building material compound of oyster shells, lime, and sand mixed with water” specific to the southeast coast of North America.; The Beaufort Preservation Manual, prepared for the City of Beaufort by John Milner Architects, Inc. November 15, 2022, 323. \url{http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/DocumentCenter/View/7836/Beaufort-Preservation-Manual_2022}. Tabby construction in Beaufort is of particular significance for its ability to convey both ecological and technological ingenuity on the part of Indigenous Americans, colonists, plantation owners, and enslaved people. In the Sea Islands, where Beaufort is located, building materials were scarce, nonexistent, or too expensive to import according to the perspective of European colonizers familiar with different masonry building materials. Indigenous Americans of this area likely would not have described a dearth of available building material. The area resource most abundant and most visible to European colonizers were the large shell rings, similar to middens,
scattered throughout the Sea Islands that consisted of large mounds of dried oyster shells acting as an architectural ruin of sorts that attested to Indigenous American settlement of the islands. The shells were used to create a highly localized building material and therefore, architectural tradition that Beaufort continues to this day by preserving extant tabby ruins, sites, and structures. Colin Brooker and Lawrence S. Roland, *The Shell Builders: Tabby Architecture of Beaufort, South Carolina, and the Sea Islands* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2020), x, 1-2.
In addition to strict local regulations guiding the changes in Beaufort’s built environment, the city’s natural environment is conserved by the Beaufort Open Land Trust, a nonprofit that works to protect “many types of land,” including “iconic vistas…parks and greenspace…[and] working farms.” Together, these local entities successfully conserve and create a distinct sense of time and place in Beaufort that both visitors and long-time residents enjoy.

Preservation Laws and 1313 Congress Street

The house at 1313 Congress Street in Beaufort is part of the original 1969 National Register of Historic Places designation and the 1973 National Historic Landmark District designation. It is also included in the local Beaufort Historic District. Despite the geographic inclusion of the house at 1313 Congress Street and its surrounding context in these designations, I found little evidence of sustained, long-term preservation effort into it or houses similar to it in Beaufort. In fact, the disparity of information available related to Freedmen’s Cottages versus the antebellum mansions scattered throughout the rest of Beaufort resulted in my research and findings being some of the first in-depth preservation related documentation of the house at 1313 Congress Street. The city has successfully preserved a distinct sense of place and time by preserving and promoting its built and natural heritage, but what narratives are dominantly displayed by those efforts? In other words – how has Beaufort focused its preservation efforts since the 1960s and what stories have been highlighted? And what stories have been buried?

Through my investigation into the house at 1313 Congress Street, I learned that both the federal and local governing authorities have favored the conservation of sites, structures, and districts associated with Beaufort’s White, wealthy, and powerful population and outright ignored or greatly downplayed the importance of structures, sites, and districts associated with Beaufort’s less powerful populations – namely the lower-income Black community established in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood following the Civil War. These authorities, as well as the larger preservation community, have made strides to evolve preservation practice to be more encompassing and inclusive of non-dominant groups’ histories in recent years, however, there remains work to be done.
This debate has been ongoing in the field since at least January and February of 1975 when Herbert J. Gans and Ada Louise Huxtable debated about it in the *New York Times*. Huxtable favored the conservation of “superb examples of the art of architecture,” whereas Gans advocated for what he called “popular architecture.”245 For the most part, the field of preservation is evolving to be more inclusive of preserving both the “superb” architecture associated with the rich and powerful and the vernacular “popular” architecture of the rest of society, however, more needs to be done. As Gans argued: “Private citizens are of course entitled to save their own past, but when preservation becomes a public act, supported with public funds, it must attend to everyone’s past.”246 In Beaufort, it is not only local funds being used for preservation but state and federal as well, greatly increasing the urgent importance of reconstructing preservation practices to reflect the whole of Beaufort’s heritage. My research into the house at 1313 Congress Street is an attempt at reconstructing preservation practice by shifting focus and attention to a rich cultural resource that until recently has not been recognized by the larger preservation community for its invaluable cultural meaning. It is an examination of Beaufort preservation practice, a critique, and hopefully a model for future practice.

**Federal Preservation Efforts of 1313 Congress Street**

At the federal level, 1313 Congress has been recognized by the National Register of Historic Places since the 1969 designation of the entire city of Beaufort, however, it is a *de facto* preservation as the original nomination focuses entirely on the architecture of the “wealthy and enterprising” inhabitants who were “obviously people of taste and cultivation” dating their contributions to the early eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century and including the location of

---
1313 Congress Street only because it was within the town boundaries at the time.\textsuperscript{247} The Civil War is listed as an area of significance but the Reconstruction Era is omitted entirely, as is any associated architecture despite the Period of Significance being described as the eighteenth to twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{248} In 1986, an addendum was added to the 1969 Nomination Form “to include the history of the town between ca. 1860 and ca. 1935.”\textsuperscript{249} The addendum is more inclusive, describing Beaufort’s changing population following the Civil War and how the built environment reflects those changes, including that “Little new durable construction occurred in Beaufort during the 1860s except for churches built to house newly formed black congregations and perhaps some cottages north of Prince Street.”\textsuperscript{250} In 1994, two maps were added to the nomination. In 2001, another addendum was approved and added to the nomination. The 2001 update is much more exhaustive and includes a description and 1997 survey photograph of 1313 Congress Street as a single 1-story frame dwelling dated to 1870 that contributes to the Beaufort Historic District.\textsuperscript{251}


97
This addendum expands the period of significance to 1950, includes a description of the distinct neighborhoods of Beaufort, and describes the “folk building patterns” evident almost entirely in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, including categorizing 1313 Congress Street as a hall and parlor house “similar to the ‘Freedman’s Cottages’ documented in the rural areas of South Carolina’s costal region.” Additionally, the 2001 addendum reflects on past preservation practices in Beaufort noting, “Despite the city’s longstanding commitment to historic preservation, a great deal of change has occurred within the past twenty years.” They emphasize that the “most notable among the losses have been the relatively large number of modest post-Civil War dwellings within the Old Common and Northwest quadrant neighborhoods” with the

---

Northwest Quadrant neighborhood losing 50% of its contributing resources between the 1968 survey of the town for the original 1969 designation and the 1998 survey for the 2001 addendum. Furthermore, the 2001 addendum greatly expands the statement of significance by highlighting Beaufort’s role in African-American history “both during and after the war” as well as praising “the high-style architecture produced by its pre-war planters and for the folk architectural patterns of its post-war African-American community.” The principal author of the 2001 addendum, David Schneider, was the Executive Director of Historic Beaufort Foundation from 1995 to 1999, illustrating that the local preservation community was evolving preservation practice in Beaufort by expanding the statement of significance for the district to include and highlight Beaufort’s African-American history. Historic Beaufort Foundation is a local non-profit with a mission to “preserve, protect and present sites and artifacts of historic, architectural and cultural interest throughout Beaufort County, South Carolina.” Though the original 1969 National Register Nomination for the Beaufort Historic District has been updated, technically the National Historic Landmark nomination document has not been updated since 1973. In November 2021, the National Park Service initiated an integrity and condition study of the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District “to document the district’s current integrity and condition and examine projects and trends that may impact ongoing preservation efforts.” In 2022, LG2 Environmental Solutions conducted the study and published their findings in a

---


document open for public review and comment from January 2023 to March 2023. The study is currently in step six of eight, “Analysis of Public Comment” as of April 2023 with “Prepare Final Summary” and “Release Final Study to the Public” being the last two steps of the study.

Their findings encompass the entirety of the Beaufort Historic District but their analysis of the conditions and integrity of the Northwest Quadrant are alarming. They write:

At the time the BNHLD was first listed, little was known, researched, or recorded regarding Beaufort’s African American histories and architecture, despite the unique role the city played in the Reconstruction Era as a majority African American city after the Civil War. Except for some churches, a few frame residences, and the Grand Army of the Republic Lodge, very few African American resources were identified…The 2001 National Register update identified 151 resources in this same area contributing…but in the twenty years since…it is likely that many of these resources have since been demolished…After the Civil War, the Northwest Quadrant of the BNHLD was home to the city’s largest African American freedmen community, with West Street developing into the “Black Wall Street” of business in Beaufort. This built heritage and corresponding stories have largely been lost, however, as West Street’s historical associations are not publicly recognized within the larger community or interpreted through signage…assessment findings revealed that the area of the District that has experienced the largest loss of historic buildings is the Northwest Quadrant…More equity work is necessary to readjust the stated significance.

Indeed, more equity work is necessary to address the preservation injustices perpetuated by the federal government’s past preservation practices in Beaufort, however, they have made great strides and continue to do so which can serve as a model for equitable preservation in the future.

Local Preservation Efforts of 1313 Congress Street

At the local level, preservation efforts in Beaufort are equally if not more storied than the federal preservation efforts of Beaufort’s heritage. Following the creation of the Beaufort

Historic District and its listing on the National Register of Historic Places in 1969, the City of Beaufort published a preservation plan in 1971 and passed a historic preservation zoning ordinance in 1972.\textsuperscript{261} The city used their legal powers codified in the historic preservation ordinance to create a locally controlled historic district that follows the same boundaries as the 1969 National Register listing as well as the 1973 National Historic Landmark District designation.\textsuperscript{262} As previously mentioned, the governing body responsible for reviewing and taking action on projects within Beaufort’s local Historic District is the Historic Review Board, or HRB.\textsuperscript{263} The HRB is the local authority essentially responsible for controlling change in the 300+ acres of the city of Beaufort within the local district boundaries. They are guided by the “Beaufort Preservation Manual” (1979), the “Beaufort Preservation Manual, Supplement” (1990), the “Northwest Quadrant Design Principles” (1999), the Secretary of Interior’s “Standards for Rehabilitation,” and from the city code: the Building Design Standards & Historic District Infill Design Guidelines.\textsuperscript{264} Additionally, the HRB adopted an update to the Beaufort Preservation Manual in November 2022 that is not yet in the city code which guides their decision-making process regarding managing change in the local Beaufort Historic District.\textsuperscript{265}

\textsuperscript{262} Beaufort, South Carolina, the Beaufort Development Code, ch. 2 § 7.1. (2023). https://library.municode.com/sc/beaufort/codes/the_beaufort_development_code.
\textsuperscript{263} Beaufort, South Carolina, the Beaufort Development Code, ch. 10 § 7, (2023). https://library.municode.com/sc/beaufort/codes/the_beaufort_development_code.
\textsuperscript{264} Beaufort, South Carolina, the Beaufort Development Code, ch. 9 § 10, (2023). https://library.municode.com/sc/beaufort/codes/the_beaufort_development_code.
The Beaufort Preservation Manual (1979)

In 1979, John Milner Associates created the Beaufort Preservation Manual, a document to inventory local historic assets and act as guide for change, coming together to “provide a comprehensive catalog of building recordation, specific building repair problems, and appropriate stabilization and preservation techniques” in the local Beaufort Historic District. The 1979 Beaufort Preservation Manual, the foundational document for the Historic Review Board (HRB) to regulate change in the locally controlled Beaufort Historic District, focuses almost entirely on the history and preservation principles for the architecture associated with the wealthy and powerful elite of Beaufort history, especially in the antebellum era, going so far as to claim that “the mansions are the catalyst which has underscored renewal and a distinctive pride of community” in Beaufort.

The 1979 manual does not outright exclude the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, acknowledging that the “town took on new dimensions during Reconstruction,” elaborating: “in the northwest section of town, on small lots owned previously by the antebellum planters, some local blacks built or renovated cottages for their own use, setting up a distinctive small-scale community separate from some of their fellow Freedmen who lived in the eastern section of town.”

Despite this truncated attempt at including the story of the Reconstruction Era and especially the large number of vernacular architectural resources in the northwest section of the town associated with Beaufort’s Black population (the northwest quadrant neighborhood), the 1979 manual offers an encompassing concluding sentiment: “Overall…the District represents an

---

unparalleled architectural continuum which represents more than two and half centuries of large and small, ‘polite’ and vernacular in the history of architecture.” They defend themselves in their notes by explaining: “This report must not be interpreted as an in-depth architectural history of Beaufort…It is hoped that some of the points suggested will spark new research.” Finally, in an offhand note, the 1979 manual refers to the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood as the “unenforced Historic District.” They never define or elaborate what they mean by “unenforced Historic District” though it seems to imply that this area is outside of the purview of their manual’s guidance and the HRB’s enforcement of the principles and practices outlined in the 1979 manual. In the story of preservation practice in Beaufort, the 1979 preservation manual created by John Milner Associates is foundational and significant, especially since it “still guides the district today,” however, it is a harmful document in that it largely overlooks and ignores the vernacular architecture of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, effectively attempting to erase Black stories from the authorized and official preservation narrative of Beaufort endorsed and put forward by the city.


In 1990, John Milner Associates created a supplementary document to their 1979 Beaufort Preservation Manual to update their initial recommendations and create more comprehensive instructions for both the HRB and homeowners within the local Historic District.

---


They acknowledge that their recommendations were largely informed by the findings of a 1988 study of the Beaufort Historic District conducted by Thomason Associates which was tasked with discussing the “strengths and weaknesses” of the 1979 Beaufort Preservation Manual.\textsuperscript{273} Though this document was unable to be located, the resulting Beaufort Preservation Manual Supplement (1990) indicates that there were preservation practitioners and advocates in Beaufort who felt the original document needed review and supplementation to better preserve Beaufort history. It is unknown who or what organization formed behind the scenes to hire Thomason Associates and initiate a review and recommendations report, however, that entity was actively evolving preservation practice in Beaufort and taking a step toward a more encompassing, inclusive, and just preservation practice. Most notably, that report and the subsequent 1990 supplement defines the enforced and unenforced sectors of the local Beaufort Historic District:

> In the ‘non-enforced’ sector, which occupies roughly the northwestern quadrant of the Historic Beaufort District, it was until recently the City’s practice to have no BOAR [Board of Architectural Review] review, with the occasional exception of certain projects involving either demolition or alterations to pre-1900 buildings. Conversely, in the ‘enforced sector,’ the BOAR has reviewed projects in accordance with its jurisdiction, procedures, and responsibilities as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. This practice subdividing the Historic Beaufort District is not incorporated into existing City ordinances.\textsuperscript{274}

The 1990 supplement is essentially admitting that the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood – the area where Beaufort’s African American population established and built a thriving community for themselves – has been being ignored or “unenforced” by the city of Beaufort since the creation of the district and ordinances. The 1990 supplement elaborates:

Although this distinction has clearly become regulatory practice in Beaufort, it is one which is nowhere articulated in the Ordinance itself...In other words, it has been the City’s practice to have the BOAR review no projects in the non-enforced sector...despite the Zoning Ordinance’s requirements for the BOAR to review all new construction, demolition, and exterior alteration projects within the entire Historic Beaufort District. The source of this practice is difficult to determine but appears to be related to certain recommendations contained in the Preservation Plan prepared for the City of Beaufort in 1972 by Russell Wright.\textsuperscript{275}

The Russell Wright Preservation Plan to which they refer is a 1972 document that recommended reducing the local Beaufort Historic District boundaries to eliminate the “high proportion of buildings of no architectural or historic significance…[which] could conceivably weaken the legality of architectural control for the Historic District as a whole.”276 If the City had adopted this recommendation, it would have eliminated the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood from the locally controlled Historic District on the basis that the neighborhood has a “high proportion of buildings of no architectural or historic significance.”277 Though the City did not officially remove the Northwest Quadrant from the local district boundaries, it was accepted practice to remove the neighborhood from oversight. The 1990 supplement attempts to solve this legal issue by suggesting the creation of an overlay district, the Conservation District, which would cover the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood and require oversight by the BOAR (at the time) and the HRB (currently). Unlike the rest of the local Beaufort Historic District, which requires strict oversight per the original historic preservation zoning ordinance, the proposed Conservation District overlay zone in the Northwest Quadrant would require oversight on “demolition, new construction, and additions to the main façade of buildings fifty years old or older.”278 The 1990 supplement attempts to re-incorporate the Northwest Quadrant into preservation practice, reflecting shifting attitudes and understanding of the larger story of Beaufort and the significance of its whole history:

These proposed modifications to the Ordinance reflect the growing awareness of the contribution that the northwestern quadrant of the District makes to the architectural and historical character of the entire Historic Beaufort District. The proposed Conservation District predominantly contains modest vernacular structures, which nevertheless

exemplify the Historic District’s remarkable combination of architectural continuity and
diversity. The preservation of the essential character and characteristics of these
structures is necessary to maintain the entire District’s significance.279

Though the suggestion to create and codify an overlay zone in the Northwest Quadrant was a
step in the direction of acknowledging the importance of preserving the architectural history of
Beaufort’s Black neighborhood, the decision still reflects Beaufort’s preservation practice legacy
of treating this area differently either by ignoring it or now, as a Conservation District, reviewing
it less extensively and differently than the rest of the Beaufort Historic District. It is important to
note that though in this particular case the creation of a Conservation District is resulting in
inequitable preservation outcomes in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood specifically it is not
always the case. In fact, conservation districts often are an extremely beneficial preservation tool
that encourages a “high level of neighborhood participation and support” to create rules and
regulations that preserve an area’s “distinctive character” when it otherwise might not be eligible
for designation as a historic district.280

Northwest Quadrant Design Principles (1999)

Following the 1988 Thomason Associates study of the 1979 Beaufort Preservation
Manual and the subsequent publication of the 1990 Beaufort Preservation Manual Supplement,
the City of Beaufort accepted the suggestion to create the Conservation District to govern the
preservation of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood. To do so, the Beaufort Code explicitly
defined the boundaries of the local Historic District as a whole and then created an internal

279 The Beaufort Preservation Manual Supplement, prepared for the City of Beaufort by John Milner Associates, August 1990,
boundary line dividing the district into two subdistricts: the Beaufort Conservation Neighborhood (BCN) and the Beaufort Preservation Neighborhood (BPN).  

As awareness of the “important architectural and historical resources” present in the northwest quadrant neighborhood grew, the city commissioned and adopted the Northwest Quadrant Design Principles to guide changes in the Beaufort Conservation Neighborhood specifically. This document focuses entirely on the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood and describes the development of the area following the Civil War: “In the latter 1800s, Beaufort’s economy recovered…[and] allowed many African-Americans to leave the former plantations to settle in

---

town. As a result, new houses were built throughout the city, and especially within the Northwest Quadrant, to accommodate this population.”

Their history of the development of the neighborhood continues with a note that “Although still predominantly an African American neighborhood, a small number of immigrant residents from Europe and Asia are indicated in census records by 1900.” And, for the first time in Beaufort preservation practice, the 1999 Northwest Quadrant Design Principles document provides examples of the “typical building types” found throughout the neighborhood with brief descriptions, timelines, and histories written about the types accompanied by photographs. 1313 Congress Street is featured as an example of a Freedmen’s Cottage.

---

**Typical Building Types**

The following is a brief description of the typical building types found in the neighborhood.

**Freedmen’s Cottage**

(circa 1850 - 1880)

The first houses of newly freed African-Americans tended to reflect their modest economic circumstances and the simple architecture of the plantation slave houses they were familiar with. These houses are recognized by their simple architectural character—typically rectangular in plan, 1 room in depth, with a steep lateral gable roof and a front shed porch.

Figure 4.12: Featured Photograph of 1313 Congress Street as an example of a Freedmen’s Cottage in Northwest Quadrant Design Principles. Image Source: The Beaufort Preservation Manual (2022).

---


Additionally, the Northwest Quadrant Design Principles include chapters titled, “Character-Defining Features” and “Design Principles” which guide the HRB as well as homeowners in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood. The Design Principles conclude:

The key to the character of the Northwest Quadrant is that it is a collection of relatively modest buildings which have been combined with the surrounding landscape. The basic way in which simple house forms were used, the manner in which they were set back from the street with small front yards and the limited range of building materials were important characteristics. These, and the consistent use of a front porch are the elements that must be preserved in order to maintain the traditional character of the area. These are the elements that the BOAR will focus on when determining the appropriateness of proposed work.286

While their acknowledgement of the character of the area and their call to preserve such features is foundational, they include a note which somewhat reneges the entire purpose of the Northwest Quadrant Design Principles: “It is important to note that many of the building details are secondary to the historic context and therefore greater flexibility in their treatment is appropriate.”287 Though perhaps “greater flexibility” in preservation practice can create positive outcomes in many ways, in this case it is another example of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood receiving unequal treatment in comparison with the rest of the Historic District. Conservation Districts are defined by the National Trust as “areas located in residential neighborhoods with a distinct physical character…contributing to the community at large,” which is certainly true for the Northwest Quadrant, however, they argue that “these neighborhoods tend not to merit designation as a historic district.”288 Clearly the Northwest Quadrant does merit designation as it was included in in the 1969 National Register of Historic Places designation, the 1972 locally established Historic District, and the 1973 National Historic

Landmark District designation. The 1999 Northwest Quadrant Design Principles greatly increased the visibility of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood and greatly increased the resources available for preserving the history of Beaufort’s Black and immigrant communities present in the built landscape there, however, it falls short in a lot of ways by ultimately continuing the legacy of treating this area differently than the rest of Beaufort’s Historic District. To tell the whole story of Beaufort, design guidelines and preservation practices which preserve the whole of Beaufort must be devised.

*Beaufort Preservation Manual (2022)*

In November 2022, the firm John Milner Associates prepared and released a new edition of the Beaufort Preservation Manual intended to update the 1979 Manual and bolster the 1990 supplement. Much of the same language and examples are used, including the note that the cottages in the Northwest Quadrant are “a subject in need of in-depth research.” The new edition of the Beaufort Preservation Manual, though not updating the history of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, does now include examples of architectural features from the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood in the chapters discussing interventions, repairs, alterations, and other changes such as the house at 809 Bladen Street and the house at 1301 Washington Street. Additionally, the 2022 update includes an appendix titled, “Northwest Quadrant Design Principles,” which briefly explains why the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood is treated

---

separately from the rest of the Beaufort Historic District.\textsuperscript{292} Finally, the 2022 Manual includes the Northwest Quadrant Design Principles as an appendix.\textsuperscript{293} Though the 2022 Manual acknowledges this historical pattern of focusing preservation efforts on the architecture associated with Beaufort’s elite past, it continues the tradition of segregating preservation resources by only appending the 1999 Northwest Quadrant Guidelines instead of offering an update like the rest of Beaufort’s Historic District. In short, local preservation resources and policies in Beaufort have historically favored conserving Beaufort’s wealthy and elite past and, unfortunately, continue to do so today. Despite the leaps and bounds that the local preservation laws and practices in Beaufort have made to address the importance of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, there are still changes to be made. As previously mentioned, the 2001 addendum to the Beaufort Historic District National Register of Historic Places listing describes the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood as losing 50\% of its contributing resources between the initial 1969 listing and the 2001 addendum, noting that “the Northwest Quadrant has suffered a much greater rate of demolition and inappropriate alteration than have other neighborhoods.”\textsuperscript{294} The 2022 National Park Service Conditions and Integrity Study of the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District does not assign a number to the losses between 2001 and 2022 in the Northwest Quadrant but notes that it is the neighborhood “of particular concern to participants” who attended community meetings and voiced opinions about the “multiple vacancies and demolitions within the Northwest Quadrant” many of which were


“freedmen’s cottages.” As the “only African American area included as part of the original nomination,” it is of the upmost significance that preservation practices evolve to make up for the years of disinvestment and unequal preservation treatment of the Northwest Quadrant in order for the City of Beaufort to show their commitment to telling the entire history of their town.

Strategies for Preserving Vernacular Architecture

It must be noted that the Northwest Quadrant Neighborhood, as a space founded and created by and for formerly enslaved Black Beaufort citizens, is a thriving homeplace still to this day in that descendant communities recognize it as such and sustain attachment to it as a place of social and cultural significance. The preservation methods which I have thus far discussed in relationship to 1313 Congress Street and the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood are examples of the “authorized heritage discourse” or AHD in which “grand narratives of nation and aesthetics” are put forth and administered by “expert and professional judgements” who act as stewards over the past in order to create as well as reproduce “a particular set of cultural and social practices” that favor and reinforce a “dominant discourse.” Evidenced by the earlier preservation related documents put forth regarding Beaufort’s history, the AHD favored the elimination of or significant downplaying of the stories of Beaufort’s Black past by ignoring the built environment of the Northwest Quadrant. It was not until the 1999 Northwest Quadrant Design Principles Document and the 2001 update to the National Register of Historic Places listing that the AHD


296 Condition and Integrity Study for the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District, prepared for the National Park Service by LG2 Environmental Solutions, 2022, 73. https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=423&projectID=105336&documentID=125727

297 LauraJane Smith, Uses of Heritage (New York: Routledge, 2006), 42.
attempted to address and acknowledge Beaufort’s Black history present in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood. Outside of the AHD, however, are the descendants of the formerly enslaved freedpeople who dared negotiate their right to purchase property, build homes, and create a thriving community for themselves in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood. Though descendants in Beaufort are perhaps outside of the authorized heritage discourse in that the “official” preservation of the Northwest Quadrant has been neglected and continues to be neglected, descendants are preserving the Northwest Quadrant in an “unofficial” capacity by stewarding the neighborhood and retaining place-based identity there. Their “unofficial” preservation practices are not recognized by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, but they are just as or even more important for the survival of generational community heritage of a group usually excluded by the dominant authorized heritage discourse.

The neighborhood has certainly changed over the years and will continue to do so; however, it remains a fundamentally identifiable Black landscape in Beaufort, speaking to the community’s ability to preserve as well as create a legible Black “homeplace” in Beaufort that can be traced back to the settlement of the Northwest Quadrant by formerly enslaved freedpeople. The term “homeplace” as defined by noted cultural theorist bell hooks, “is a vehicle for identity production and for sustaining place attachment” and which has the power to create “spaces that foster black women’s renewal, aspiration, cultural continuity, and survival in the face of white surveillance.”

African American studies scholar Earl Lewis’s definition of a “homesphere” also applies to the house at 1313 Congress Street and the Northwest Quadrant

---

Andrea Roberts, the director of the Texas Freedom Colonies Project, argues that “African-Americans’ homesteads, post-emancipation, became freedom-seeking landscapes and at times subverted local conventions and aesthetics.” And though after the Civil War, “Southern white landowners endeavored to make the homeplace a space of social indoctrination among Reconstruction-era freedmen,” Beaufort’s formerly enslaved population created and cultivated “homeplace” and “homesphere” in the Northwest Quadrant that was subversive and therefore, another negotiation of their rights to determine and define spaces for themselves as freedpeople. The 1979 and 2022 Beaufort Preservation Manuals, both of which are AHD, refer to these subversive architectural forms as “small” and “vernacular” as opposed to the “large” and “polite” architecture throughout the rest of the district. The 2001 addendum to the National Register of Historic Places listing for the Beaufort Historic District describes the character of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood as being “defined by low scale predominantly residential folk architecture” which is “clearly distinguishable from the high style architecture found elsewhere in the historic district.”

---


practitioners of the AHD did not intend to create an architectural narrative which sets in opposition the Northwest Quadrant with the rest of the Beaufort Historic District, they did. Dr. Roberts rightly acknowledges the real power dynamic by articulating that Reconstruction Era freedpeople intentionally subverted the norms being prescribed by Southern White landowners, resulting in the Northwest Quadrant being labelled “a distinctive small-scale community separate” from the rest of Beaufort.\textsuperscript{304} Perhaps the Northwest Quadrant is especially distinct because it formed in Beaufort, a place where Reconstruction Era freedpeople greatly outnumbered the White population and, as a result, exercised considerable “black political strength” unlike any other place in South Carolina.\textsuperscript{305} This only serves as further evidence of the significance of the Northwest Quadrant and of houses like 1313 Congress Street which are the material witnesses to the generational heritage creation and conservation of African-American homeplaces and homespheres in Beaufort starting with Reconstruction Era freedpeople and continuing to this day to descendants who live in the neighborhood and keep that culture alive.

As Beaufort continues to change, the Northwest Quadrant and the house at 1313 Congress Street are more threatened than ever before. The 2022 Conditions and Integrity Study of the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District identified the following threats:

As of 2018, the Northwest Quadrant had 37 vacant properties. This problem is mostly due to the issue of heirs’ property, wherein multiple heirs own a single property...[leading] to multiple vacancies and demolitions...Infrastructure projects by the South Carolina DOT and Dominion Energy have disproportionately impacted this area as well. The South Carolina DOT has acquired large easements and rights of way impacting properties. In the early 2000s Dominion acquired easements along Wilmington Street and installed massive metal utility poles...DOT and Dominion Energy easements and SOWs limit owner options on multiple properties. Finally, between the rising cost of property


\textsuperscript{305} David B. Schneider, “Beaufort Historic District,” National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (Beaufort, SC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001), Section 8.
and the heirs’ property issue, the Northwest Quadrant is being gentrified, with many of the original residents unable to afford living in the area.306

And though the descendant community in Beaufort has shouldered the work of reconstructing preservation practice by preserving the Northwest Quadrant despite the AHD putting out documents which ignore and downplay its significance, allowing issues like heirs’ rights and infrastructure projects to negatively impact the neighborhood, it is time that preservation practitioners take up the burden of reconstructing preservation practice to be more inclusive, encompassing, and representative of all stories. I am both demanding that AHD preservation practitioners in Beaufort formally acknowledge their past injustices and attempt to create just outcomes in the future by fully investing their current resources and formal practices in the Northwest Quadrant and in houses like 1313 Congress Street as well as demanding that the AHD preservation practice field itself undergo a reconstruction that results in standards, principles, and practices that are more inclusive, encompassing, representative, and equitable. As Brent Leggs, the Executive Director of the African American Cultural Heritage Action Fund and Senior Vice President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, writes, “We preserve landscapes, buildings and neighborhoods that show the richness of African American life, history and architecture…We tell overlooked stories embodied in these places: ones of African American resilience, activism and achievement that are fundamental to the nation itself.”307 And if we are able to do this successfully, the preservation of these places “can foster validation of the Black experience,” a fundamental necessity if we are to tell the whole story of American history.308


It is a challenge to create accurate and encompassing documentation procedures which fully honor and deepen understanding of community histories which have largely been ignored by the AHD, however, practices and methodologies are emerging which attempt to do just that. First, it is critical to establish a baseline preservation practice in which “decisions about the future of African American communities are made by and in collaboration with neighborhood residents, organizations, and political leaders.”\(^{309}\) This kind of reconstructed preservation practice ensures that the voices of community members are empowered “to lead, engage, and organize for their future.”\(^{310}\) The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s foundational report, Preserving African American Places: Growing Preservation’s Potential as a Path for Equity, cites Seattle’s Race and Social Justice Initiative as an example of a long-running and “comprehensive model” that practitioners can learn from in their attempts to mitigate “persistent forms of institutional racism” present in preservation practice currently.\(^{311}\) They also cite the City of Oakland’s programs, “Cultural Strategists-in-Government” and “Neighborhood Voices,” which have resulted in “14 community meetings, a digital cultural asset map, and a survey of Oakland residents.”\(^{312}\) Both the examples out of Seattle and Oakland demonstrate preservation practitioners attempt to reconstruct preservation practice to prioritize the voices of African American community members as they determine the future of their community places. These examples can serve as models for reconstructing preservation practice in Beaufort.

---


Preservation practice in Beaufort can also learn from the National Trust’s call for preservation practitioners to build and support coalitions that “amplify Black agency, discourse, and thought in heritage conservation.” They cite the nonprofit, BlackSpace, as an example of “a collective of Black professionals in urban planning, architecture, real estate development, urban design, arts, and activism” that work to “protect, preserve, and support a thriving future for communities of color.” The collective published a guidebook, “Co-Designing Black Neighborhood Heritage Conservation,” which shares the “inspirations, experiences, and lessons learned from an exploratory process of co-designing heritage conservation efforts alongside members of Brownsville, one of Brooklyn’s Black enclaves” that can inform the reconstruction of preservation practice in Beaufort. In South Carolina, the WeGOJA Foundation is leading the way and modelling this kind of work as an organization working “to document and promote African American heritage sites in South Carolina.” With the mission of “telling the full story of African American Heritage in South Carolina,” the WeGOJA Foundation is a coalition actively reconstructing preservation practice and heritage conservation. The preservation community in Beaufort is robust in both the public and private sector and these entities can and should begin the work of reconstructing preservation practice by building capacity and supporting coalitions that “Assert and protect ideals, dialects, genders, spiritualities, and cultural notions that are impacted by decisions about spatial use, design, and allocation” and “Respond to and atone for the urban planning sector’s primary contributions to the legacy of slavery and

---

racism in the United States.” These are values articulated by Thrivance Group, a “for-profit, socially-responsible planning firm working, in the interest of racialized people, to bring transformative justice into public policy, urban planning and community development,” founded and led by Dr. Destiny Thomas, an anthropologist-planner from Oakland, California. For Beaufort to meaningfully transform their preservation practices, they must meaningfully embrace and support the Beaufort African American community and respectfully amplify their voices as they determine the future of the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood community.

In addition to amplifying African American community voices and supporting African American coalitions that advocate for protecting and preserving communities of color, the National Trust calls for practitioners to leverage the preservation strategies currently available. In New Orleans, the Preservation Resource Center, is advocating for “alleviating financial burdens of African American homeowners” in the Treme local historic district. The area is one of New Orleans’ “most historic and culturally rich neighborhoods,” but residents struggle to afford expensive maintenance resulting in delays or unapproved inappropriate repairs. The Preservation Resource Center has been providing “financial assistance to low-to-moderate income homeowners who live in the district” to aid in preservation efforts. In Beaufort, this preservation model could be used to help alleviate some of the threats identified by the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District Conditions and Integrity Study. In November 2022, The Freedman Arts District was formed in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood in Beaufort with

the intention of promoting and encouraging “arts, artists, artistic endeavors and art lovers in the District.” Additionally, the organization partners with “families that own property in the district, to assist in keeping ownership within the family while restoring the property as a functioning asset for the family. Heirs property is a particular focus.” It remains to be seen how this brand-new organization will affect just and equitable outcomes in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood for Black Beaufortonians, however, it is a step toward reconstructing preservation practice in Beaufort by leveraging preservation practices currently available and forming an organization that advocates for families in the district.

All strategies so far mentioned are necessary and important for equitably doing the work of reconstructing preservation practice and can and should be models for Beaufort’s preservation community if they wish to tell the whole of Beaufort’s history truly and equitably through their preservation efforts. Two specific projects must additionally be cited as other models for Beaufort’s reconstruction of their preservation practice: The Texas Freedom Colonies Project and the University of Oregon’s Albina Research Initiative. Both projects are concerned with conservation of historic Black homeplaces and homespheres to recognize and preserve the rich and empowering history of Black space creation and conservation, specifically of places like the Northwest Quadrant. And like the Northwest Quadrant, the Freedom Colonies communities and the Albina neighborhood primarily draw their significance not from monumental architecture or grandiose development patterns, but from the “everyday and mundane” objects of their landscape which the community transforms to “embrace and validate the everyday patterns and rituals of neighborhoods.”

at 1313 Congress Street specifically, I learned in an oral history interview with Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes about how their father, Booker T. Stokes, would nightly stand on the front porch of their family home down the street from his mother’s house, 1313 Congress Street, and wait for her lights to turn off as a way to make sure she was fine each evening. This nightly ritual is an example of an everyday practice that is, inherently mundane in that it involves very simple actions and very simple objects (front porch and lights), however, it is of the utmost significance in that it signaled visibility, safety, security, and connection in the landscape between their houses (approximately 1 block away or about 600 feet). It is an intangible heritage.

It is unclear if the larger Northwest Quadrant community was aware of this practice of everyday life or how it impacted their relationship to the larger Northwest Quadrant landscape physically or emotionally, but it is known that it was significant enough for Annie Mae and Shirley to recall it fifty plus years later as a practice that daily connected them to their grandmother, her home, and the landscape between them. It is difficult to imagine a preservation practice which can somehow encompass, include, and preserve that kind of simple but profoundly significant practice, however, both the Texas Freedom Colonies Project and the Albina Research Initiative
(in combination with all previously mentioned strategies) can offer ideas and visions for reconstructing preservation practice in Beaufort.

The Texas Freedom Colonies Project was founded in 2014 by Dr. Andrea Roberts, Associate Professor of Urban and Environmental Planning and Co-Director of the University of Virginia’s Center for Cultural Landscapes who is a 6th-generation Texan and freedom colony descendant. The project’s purpose is education and social justice initiatives “dedicated to supporting the preservation of Black settlement landscapes, heritage, and grassroots preservation practices through research.” With a goal of preventing the “erasure, destruction, and decay of cultural properties within Black settlements in partnership with descendant communities,” Beaufort preservation practice can and should learn from this model and at least adopt a set of similar guidelines that will formally commit the City to acknowledging the importance of preserving Black heritage in the Northwest Quadrant. The Texas Freedom Colonies successes comes from the following strategies they employ:

Recording and safeguarding stories and materials associated with freedom colonies’ origins & decline. Hosting and maintaining an interactive, publicly accessible Atlas & Database of freedom colony locations including GIS layers indicating development and ecological threats. Identifying resources for and co-developing community resilience strategies and policies with freedom colony descendants using the contents of the Atlas and Database.

In addition to adopting guidelines similar to the goals of the Texas Freedom Colonies Project, Beaufort preservation practices could similarly learn from their preservation strategies and consider creating and maintaining a Northwest Quadrant community archive, host and maintain an interactive geographic information systems (GIS) web-based map to document and raise

---

awareness of sights of significance to Black Beaufortonians in the Northwest Quadrant, and of course, co-develop these programs in partnership with the descendant community in the neighborhood to ensure that the community itself is at the forefront of visioning its future while preserving its past.

The Albina Research Initiative demonstrates another vital model that Beaufort preservation practice can and should learn from in their pursuit of reconstructing preservation practice to be more encompassing, inclusive, representative, and equitable. At the University of Oregon, a group of preservationists, planners, and architects “initiated a community-oriented research project to explore Albina, Portland’s primary historically Black neighborhood,” in an attempt to “document the presence of a vibrant African American community” as well as “consider how the fieldwork tools of vernacular architecture studies” can “deepen our understanding of this historically important minority community and potentially serve as a catalyst for preserving and strengthening it.”

Led by James Buckley, Venerable Chair in Historic Preservation, the project embraces and celebrates the vernacular. Buckley argues that “a vernacular approach…refers to a way of investigating all types of buildings in terms of their broad relationship with the physical, social, and economic environment” and allows practitioners to track “the physical traces of people who left little written record of their existence, including immigrants, illiterate workers, and enslaved people.” Their fieldwork methods, investigating building fabric, utilizing historical data, and relying on human subjects, are doing the work of reconstructing preservation practice by pushing the boundaries of AHD preservation practices to become more encompassing and inclusive. Though theirs is an ongoing process as are most


projects of this kind, the project helps to create a more “complete picture of this cultural landscape” that aids in telling the full story of Portland’s history.  


Beaufort preservation practitioners can and should embrace a fieldwork in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood which recovers “the lived experience of neighborhood inhabitants – including their ordinary routines as well as their noteworthy moments” to help “foster retention and rebuilding” of the Northwest Quadrant community.

As I researched the house at 1313 Congress Street and came to understand the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood, it became clear that Beaufort’s past and current preservation practices fall short in their ability to accurately document and preserve the complex and rich heritage present in these places. For many years, the neighborhood was quite literally ignored by preservation practitioners despite formal inclusion of both the house at 1313 Congress Street and the entire Northwest Quadrant neighborhood in federal and local historic district designations. Despite Beaufort’s AHD preservation practices best efforts to ignore, erase, forget, alter, demolish, and let decay the built landscape of its city’s African American community, residents of the Northwest Quadrant resiliently continued the work of their freedpeople ancestors by continuously negotiating their right to take up space, own property, build homes, and build community. Generations of Black Beaufortonians contributed to the creation of a legible Black landscape, homeplace, and homesphere in the Northwest Quadrant. Only in “making visible” these “forgotten” histories hiding in Beaufort’s landscape can preservation practitioners truly say they are committed to telling the whole story of Beaufort.


Conclusion

The story of the house at 1313 Congress Street, the story of the Stokes family, of Daniel Simmons, and the Reconstruction Era are all stories of perseverance, resilience, and bravery. I never imagined that my journey to South Carolina in May of 2022 would lead me on a path where I encountered such astounding stories and the incredible built environment that humbly holds those legacies. Working for the National Park Service at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park changed my life in more ways than one and I grew to love the rural South Carolina landscape and especially Beaufort’s coastal island lifestyle. It is a mesmerizing place, and its National Historic Landmark District designation attests to that. Now, a year later, after many lectures, discussions, research rabbit-holes, interviews, archive-visits, books, articles, and much more, I have a story to tell about the house at 1313 Congress Street, how it came to be, who the people are who brought it to life, why their stories matter, and together – why it is significant. Moreover, I have an urgent call to action for all preservation practitioners to take up the work of reconstructing preservation practice to make it more inclusive, equitable, encompassing, and just so that the stories of all people can be part of the narrative and preserved.

Summary of Findings

The first chapter covers the history of Beaufort, South Carolina prior to the Civil War and argues that our nation, and especially places like Beaufort, are fundamentally Black landscapes in that they were created by the work that enslaved African people and their enslaved African American descendants did in the years leading up to the Civil War. Life in Beaufort during the Civil War is also discussed though this section overlaps with the Reconstruction Era (1861-1900)
in which formerly enslaved Freedpeople negotiated new rights for themselves and their communities, fundamentally changing the socioeconomic and physical landscapes of Beaufort.

The second chapter summarizes the land development history of the site where the house at 1313 Congress Street is located. It is a much more focused chapter though it begins by acknowledging the longer history of land use in the greater Beaufort coastal region starting with Indigenous presence in the area, the colonial period, and the founding of the town. The chain of title history associated with Block 100 and the parcel where 1313 Congress Street is located is summarized using deed transactions as well as other legal documents and newspaper reports.

The third chapter is different from the other chapters in that it is structured around the life of one person, Edith Stokes. Stokes lived in the house at 1313 Congress Street for at least 57 years and built her life and her community from there. I relied on the oral history interview I conducted in July 2022 with her granddaughters, Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes, to guide my understanding of Edith Stokes’ life and used records such as the census, deed transactions, death certificates, obituaries, draft registration cards, and fire insurance maps to fill in details. The house at 1313 Congress Street and the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood where it is situated are, in addition to her surviving heirs, some of the best insights we have into the life of Edith Stokes and understanding the incredible life she built despite being born the year the Civil War ended and growing up and then raising her family during the Jim Crow era in the American south.

The fourth and final chapter is split into two parts: Part one explains the authorized heritage discourse preservation practices available to and being utilized by practitioners to preserve Beaufort history and critically examines the inequitable outcomes and one-sided narratives created by these practices. Part two offers strategies for preserving vernacular architecture, sites, structures, and areas using methods and models that have been developed by
and for places associated with African American history specifically. Though the entire thesis is a call to action for preservation practitioners to push the boundaries of our field to be more equitable, inclusive, encompassing, and just, this chapter most of all presents the case that our field as it is currently practiced marginalizes architecture, sites, structures, objects, places, stories, and people and that it is of the utmost importance that we take up the burden of doing the work of reconstructing preservation practices so that we can preserve the whole story of our history. 1313 Congress Street is one house in which these larger issues are made visible.

Further Research

As the consulting company, LG2 Environmental Solutions, wrote in their Conditions and Integrity Assessment for the Beaufort National Historic Landmark District report, made public in January 2023: “More equity work is necessary to readjust the stated significance of the District. Nationally significant for its Reconstruction Era African American history, additional documentation for addressing Reconstruction Era associations…should be adopted.” More equity work is indeed necessary and some of the starting points I have after researching the story of 1313 Congress Street and the story of the Stokes family are as follows:

- Build capacity for African American community members in Beaufort to share their stories about their family homes, their descendants, and their places – both still in existence and physically lost. The information I learned from one interview with Annie Mae and Shirley Stokes about their grandmother, the house at 1313 Congress Street, and their lives and personal histories of Beaufort was paramount to this entire project. Black Beaufort residents, both past and present, have been place-keeping as long as any other resident of the sea islands and our preservation practitioners should begin their work of
reconstructing the field by listening. It was beyond the scope of this project to conduct and collect multiple oral history interviews with long-time residents of the Northwest Quadrant, but I believe that those stories would be an excellent beginning to reconstructing preservation practices in Beaufort.

- Create and curate formal archival collections specific to the African American history of Beaufort which will create a repository where residents, researchers, preservationists, and community members can come together to learn from primary sources about the lived experience of Black Beaufort residents going back as early as captured Africans being sold into slavery in Beaufort through to their role in building Beaufort and building the nation, to the Civil War, Reconstruction, the Jim Crow South, the Civil Rights Era and beyond. There are different repositories throughout South Carolina and the United States which safeguard the scattered ephemera associated with the incredible history of African Americans in Beaufort, however, there is a need for these powerful records to return to Beaufort and be brought to the forefront of the historical narratives being told in the city. One set of records which comes to mind are the Records of the South Carolina Direct Tax Commission, housed in the National Archives in Washington, D.C. which generally detail life in Beaufort from 1862 to 1899 with some earlier and later maps included. Though some of these records are digitized, most remain only in their physical form in D.C. and generally inaccessible whether digital or not. Part of the work of reconstructing preservation practice should be making available records and resources associated with African American history in Beaufort in order to preserve the whole history of the city.

- In the Northwest Quadrant Neighborhood specifically, there is much work to be done to document, research, and preserve the sites, structures, and spaces associated with the
African American community history there as well as the immigrant communities established there in the years after Reconstruction. In researching just one house, 1313 Congress Street and trying to understand the developmental history of Block 100, I was constantly running into leads and hints about other people, sites, places, and histories in the neighborhood which need further research. It is not just 1313 Congress Street which is under threat of demolition by decay but there are many other early resources associated with the Reconstruction Era and beyond whose stories need to be told. It was outside the scope of this project to research and document all Reconstruction Era sites associated with Beaufort’s Black community in the Northwest Quadrant, but it is a necessary project if preservation practices are to be meaningfully reconstructed in Beaufort.

It is my hope that this project illustrates the incredibly rich and complex history of the house at 1313 Congress Street and stands as an example of how to begin the work of reconstructing preservation practice.
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Oral History Interview with Annie Mae Stokes

Transcription

Interviewer: Emily Varley, Nathan Betcher

Videographer: Paul Keyserling

Narrator: Annie Mae Stokes, Shirley Stokes

Date: July 27, 2022

Emily Varley: Hi, my name is Emily Varley. I am conducting this interview today and I am a NCPE intern at Reconstruction Era National Historical Park and I attend school at the University of Southern California, and I am interviewing Annie Mae Stokes and they – she, is our narrator today. And today's date is July 27, 2022. And we are doing this interview at your home on Washington Street and today we will be talking about the Stokes cottage and memories of Beaufort. Um, would you like to introduce yourself and say whatever you'd like.

Annie Mae Stokes: Hello. I'm Annie Mae Stokes, and I was born July the ninth 1938. This is my home. And really, if you don't think so, but I was born in my grandmother's house as my mother said. But I'm very happy to have you. And I will talk with you as much as I can. Thank you. Okay.

Emily Varley: Thank you. Okay, my first question has to be what comes to mind when you think of your childhood in Beaufort.

Annie Mae Stokes: My childhood in Beaufort was very nice to me. My grandmother, first of all, my mother, and my father, and my siblings made it very nice and pleasant for me. And my grandmother made it that much more pleasant for me, because she would give me things that I like, maybe like cupcakes when they call it pancakes or whatever, but she would make those things. And I liked those things me being the oldest of the girls, I sat down there, and I was so happy and spoiled. And she would just give me just different things that I like. And so she would tell me about different things that I didn't know, she would take me to church, she would even just take me and buy me a baby doll. And once she bought me a baby doll. And my brother thought the doll can sit down which was a stand up doll and he tried to make the doll a sit down and he broke the legs off the doll. But my childhood life was very sweet. Yes, my parents and my grandmother was very lovely and I love them to this day.
Emily Varley: So you mentioned your brother breaking the legs off of your baby doll. So talk to me a little more about your brothers and your family. Were you over at your grandmother’s house a lot? Or were you over at this home a lot? Like what was that like?

Annie Mae Stokes: Okay. I was home, I'll say both places. When my mother told me to go out maybe and help wash the clothes or something like that. And being the child I didn't want to work all the time. So I’d take off and run down to my grandmother's house and she would say, “Wow, it's very hot out there. Why are you out there in all this heat?” And I would say, “Well grandma, I said my mom, you know want me to come down here,” which was a little bit exaggeration, but I said, “Grandma my mama want me to come down here a little bit.” But when I went down there were trees along from my house, which is 1401 Washington street to my grandma house, about three trees. And the sun was so hot. I would stop under the first tree and cool my feet off because at that particular time, we didn't wear shoes very much, especially when it was hot. Then I’d cool my feet off, run to the next tree and cool my feet off at that tree then run to the next tree. And when we didn’t have the tree. This is where, you know most people would like…my dad have a horse and my brother knew how to ride the horse. So he would be first and I’d be in the middle and I have another brother at the end and we'd ride the horse to Grandma house out the sun and she’d say, “Children, why are you riding your grand-your father's horse down here in all this heat?” That's her voice when it went up. “Well, ma, you know it’s hot out there”. “Grandma its very hot out.” “Well, go and tie that horse around to the back, and pump some water from the pump.” She had a pump. And we’d go and pump the water from the pump and give the horse water to cool off. But that's when I wanted to see her. And my brothers and the horse wanted to have a little talk and a little fun with grandmother because she was very, very funny. Yes.

Emily Varley: Okay, she's very funny. What other kind of things was she doing? Was she just having to keep control of you guys, her grandkids? What other kinds of things was she doing?

Annie Mae Stokes: She had a rooster. And a rooster is the man chicken. And when we went to the gate, sometimes if we went to the front gate, the rooster was there like a dog. He wouldn't let us come in. And she would get the broom, “Go to the back, Go to the back.” And that rooster listened to her. But the rooster didn't want us in the yard. You know, we were taking all the fun and all this time away from grandmother. But he listened. He went around to the back, like he pretended. And he went through the kitchen door to the back and came to the front. And she would get the broom and she’d run him out to, you know, the front. He didn't want us there. And so she put him in the chicken coop in the yard where they kept the chickens and locked him up. So we can have fun with her. And she also have a cow. She had a cow. And she would milk that cow just about every day. And at that time when she would milk the cow, she would take the milk and do what she needed to do with the milk. Shake it up to get the cream off the top and let it mix up in the milk and we would have fresh milk. Yes.

Emily Varley: Oh my gosh. Was she – so she had a cow, she had a rooster, that was mean, did she have any other animals or?
**Annie Mae Stokes:** She had the chickens with the rooster and uh, and the cow. She didn’t have any other animals.

**Emily Varley:** Did she have a garden?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Yes, she did. She had a field, which she had, across the street from her, and she plant peanuts, corn, and beans. And then the mornings, when the weather’s nice and cool, she would go and pull up her peanuts. Yea. And we would be in there, following behind her, but we didn’t know how to do it until she showed us how to do it. And we would go and pull up the peanuts and shake off the dirt. Cuz, you know, the bottom they have dirt, sand, and the sand goes back on the ground or whatever and she’d put all the peanuts, you know, over on the side. And then she’d bring them home. And then she’d pull the peanuts off the branches. She did have a nice garden. People would come by, and she would even give peanuts and sometimes the beans, yes, to people. Cuz she did have several fields but that was one I worked in with her.

**Emily Varley:** Wow. So was it you and your siblings. You would be working out there with her in the field. Okay.

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Yes, yes, yes. Yea, my brother after me, went back, after me, and before me. They were big enough to help her, you know, fix with the garden. Yes, fix with the garden. And my oldest brother, he would go down and help maybe with heavier things maybe if she wanted to sorta move something, a bench, or if the latch came off the swing or something like that. They would help. But the smaller children helped grandmother with the field, yes. Yes.

**Emily Varley:** Wow. Oh my gosh. So, how much do you know about, like, how long she had her garden or how long she was in the house or what – I mean – anything?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Yes, okay. Um. By me being 84 years old as I speak to you now. My grandmother was there, uh, to my mother and my father. And my mother and my father, when they had me, was like, as I am calculating, about 18, 16 to 18. And she was there before my mother had me because I was born in my grandmother’s house. And speaking now, 84 years old, and she died at 104 to 105, that house should have been there, I’m calculating about, say 100 and some years or maybe more, from what I am calculating, from my age, and she died at 104 years old and mom and those having me at their age, 18, I’m saying, to me that house should be about, I’m saying, about 200 years old.

**Emily Varley:** Okay. So, she was there, we think she was born in 1862, your grandmother, if she died when she’s 104, which was in 1967, so did your parent’s, did your father ever talk about her, what his mother’s life had been like, prior to her having her kids and having your dad?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Yea, my father would say that my grandmother was a very strict woman but a loving woman. And she worked hard for her living and she worked her to bring up her children.
She’s had, as what I know, about five and all of them progressed in life and became very successful in life. And she would teach you things that she know would value you in life. Like, if you couldn’t cook, say, very good, she would say, you know, go to the store and make grandma a little pancake and she would help me make that pancake and she would make, what they called clabber. Now this is something that a lot of people, you know, sorta don’t know or don’t like. But this when, she had the cow and she wait till the milk is a little bit, say, I wouldn’t say old but, it’s more than just milk you can pour, it got a little bit thick. And she had a bowl, or a jar and they do this [holding both hands up and rocking side to side] for the day and it turned a little bit, I’m a say, differently. It turned different. And they called it clabber. Because it wasn’t milk that you can just pour out. They ate it with grits and um, my daddy would say, you know, that’s what he ate. Apparently a lot. Cuz my grandmother — I didn’t really like it. Cuz when children come and they see different things. No, I don’t want it, thank you. But anyway, she, I saw that, and she made that. So, she taught us how to do it. And she had the fig tree there and a lot of times, showed us how, if you didn’t want to eat all your figs off the tree, you could jar them. You can, you know, cook your figs, and you can jar figs and you had the figs for the wintertime, and it was like jelly. So, you know, you can save it in the pantry. Save it, in wintertime and come over there and put it on some bread. But that’s jarred food. They jarred their food. We call it canned food now cuz they use the can that they would jar. She would jar. Mother would jar food. Put it in the mason jars and we ate it. But it was good food. It was very good, yes.

**Emily Varley:** So, does your father then, he grew up in the house then?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** My dad told us that he was raised there and so he more than likely grew up. Cuz he is the baby of the family, so he more than likely got more growing up with her than the others in that house. So, that house probably was during his time a little bit more than the older one’s time, they probably had another house or something like that. But dad was the baby and then he had a younger sister, she might’ve been a few years old then, but she was grew up. But more than likely, the grandchildren, you know, grew up with her in the house. Her children’s children.

**Emily Varley:** Okay, but she was the main person living there?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** The only one in that time frame. Yes.

**Emily Varley:** So, do you remember, I guess, anything about her neighbors or was it mostly family members that were living near to your grandmother?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Okay. The neighbors were very sweet to her. And when she got a little older then when I came, she grew older, and she became, before she became blind. She did go blind. But before she did, she became blind, the neighbors were very sweet to her. They would help her bring the peanuts or something from the field when she had the plants there. If she needed the house, anything that went wrong with the house. She would have the neighbors help her fix it. the next-door lady was a schoolteacher. So, she helped her with the reading a little bit. And across, in the front of her, was a pond. Which they filled in. But it wasn’t a pond
that held a lot of water. We called it a pond because it was deeper than level ground and they filled that in, and grass grew there. Before she had a shed there where she kept her tools and whatever she needed. And she would go across the street and get a shovel, whatever she needed over there, but she sold that to one of the schoolteachers. But it was filled in. You know, they filled it, you know, nicely, to build a house there. A nice house is there now. But that was hers. So, she, would, you know. The neighbors were sweet to her, cuz she was older in the neighborhood, and they respected her, too.

Emily Varley: Was she one of the oldest women who had been in the neighborhood the longest?

Annie Mae Stokes: Yes, yes, yes. She was the oldest there. And most of the times they would go to her and wanted some corn or whatever she grew and she would help the children by giving help the people by giving corn or whatever she grew. And they loved her because she not only said hello and this, she helped them. She helped them feed those children. By which she grew. And that was food. Food was one thing we needed to survive. Yes.

Emily Varley: Wow, so, I guess. Do you remember anything, I guess, would she hang out on the porch? And you said, I think, earlier, a fence. What do you remember about being at the house?

Annie Mae Stokes: Okay. When I went to the house. She had a swing on the front porch. And quiet natural, a swing, everyone wants to sit on the swing, you know, and she also had two rockers and they were not big and glamorous but they were rocking chairs. And, I wanted to sit in the swing. You know, cuz I wanted to swing in and out. The swing went sideways to the house, not like, you know, back and forth. Cuz if this is house, you know the swing go back, but the house wasn’t that large. You’ve seen the house. The swing she had sideways, and the swing went out like its going out, but it didn’t go, you know, real far out, but it went this way. But I liked to swing back and forth cuz she was sitting there in the rocking chair. And we’d have, you know, whatever she had, peanuts or a little ice cream or a drink, a pop. Yes, but it was nice and pleasant because it seemed as it didn’t get as hot as the weather is now. Back then look like we had cooler days. But as this changing world, we can, you know, expect hotter days because the world is. Temperature is changing around the world.

Emily Varley: Right. So, was she the kind of person who always had her front door open and all of you kids were running in and out all the time?

Annie Mae Stokes: Okay. No, she didn’t have – she was strict, like I said. And when you went to the house. She would say, okay, you can go and get some water. Of course, she had an icebox, wasn’t a refrigerator. The iceman would come, or they would go out to the ice house, get their ice, 25 pound, of ice, big block, comes in block, 10 pound, the icebox could hold. It was at the top where they would put the ice and the ice would cool the fridgerator. Okay, then she had something they called, we call it a fireplace now, but they didn’t call it a fireplace, they called it a hearth. That’s what they called it. And, as our fireplaces now, got ashes, when you put wood in
it, wood burn and turn to ash. Well, hers did too. But she would use those ashes then to bake her sweet potatoes. You turn the ashes, open up the ashes, put the sweet potatoes in and cover them up with ashes. And that would cook her sweet potatoes. As me, I didn’t like the sweet potato cooked all the way because that was too, whatever, I didn’t like, you know. She liked hers cooked all the way. So, I liked it sort of firm, you know, half, you know, I can slice it and bite it. But they liked sweet potato mashed up, you know, like mashed potatoes. Well anyway, I’d put, you know, two in there. One for me and one for her cuz she would say, go in the house and put it in there and you little children, little kids they want bread or something, they didn’t like that cuz they. So I would eat with her cuz she liked hers mashed and I liked mine firm. So we would eat but she was strict she kept a nice, neat house. And we helped her clean. We’d go over there and take the pillow and pat the pillow and put the pillow back in the chair. Yes, wash the dishes, keep the kitchen clean. But no children were allowed to run and tear up things in the home. And we’ve learned that from her. To keep your home neat. Cuz she would say, company comes, and company looks, and company see so keep my house clean. And we did. And today, today, we keep a very neat, clean house. And Shirley’s verify cuz she keeps a clean, neat home. And my other sister did, and my sister. We’re very neat people.

**Emily Varley:** Wow. Wow. Oh my gosh. She sounds incredible. And sounds like you learned a lot of cooking from her.

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Yes, I learned cleaning. Cleaning yes, cooking. Cleaning. Taking care of the children, which we always took care of the smaller kids. They were, you know, they had to play when they had to learn. Cuz children gonna be children. But, don’t hurt the little fellow, you know, sit him in the chair, pick him up and sit him down, you know, easily. So we were very careful with our siblings. They taught us not to be rough with them. Yes, yes, yes.

**Emily Varley:** Wow, I guess, did she ever talk about what her life was like before she was, I guess before all you guys were all around, running around?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** She didn’t talk so very much. But she talked on, on her life that is. She was married. And her husband, as she said, her husband was a traveling man. So, I assume that he was a person that, sort of had, sales, salesman. Some sort of salesperson. My grandfather I didn’t know very well, and you know, I can’t talk on him too much cuz I didn’t know him that well. And never even seen him. But what grandmother would say, he would sort of come and go, cuz she had plenty children. She had lots of children, right, just as many kids as my mother and father, and there’s ten of us, so he had to come home sometimes.

**Emily Varley:** Wow, so I guess he would come to the house on Congress?

**Annie Mae Stokes:** Yes, to the house. And then he would go back. So, probably in mind like a truck driver. You know, the truck driver goes and stay for a couple of weeks and return home. So, he was a salesperson cuz he would come, and you know, be with her, and love her, you know her, and the children. But I didn’t grow to know him.

Annie Mae Stokes: I knew her.

Emily Varley: Man, yea, I mean I guess, she raised all of you all. And basically, raised all the generations of your family it sounds like.

Annie Mae Stokes: Yes, it was like, as I was telling, asking Shirley last night. I said, you know, its four generations of from her and then, she was, you know, telling, yea. Well, in fact I said it was three. And she said, no sis, its four. And my dad, and then his children, and then his children’s children, and then the grand, the great great grand. We were figuring. We were trying to figure it out last night cuz I went to three generations, but we end up with four generations, so there’s four generations of us. Yes.

Emily Varley: Well, I guess, if there’s any other things you want to talk about specifically, I mean, either about your parents or about your grandmother, about your neighbors or about Beaufort, but anything else you would like to talk about?

Annie Mae Stokes: Okay, well, we all loved church as I said. All loved Church. And we went to Central Baptist Church on Sundays. We would be ready when she come down from her house, to the side here and but she would give us a call when she gets to that highway, what’s – Green Street – that’s Green Street. To let us know she’s almost at the house. Children, I’m here. And she would be over there to that corner there. We’re ready. We’re ready. And she would stop and we’d walk down to the church with her. And when we get to the church. Some most of the time, a lot of the time, more than one or two times, she’s a little bit behind time, you know, late. The devotion part is finished. And I was a child, you know we’d go, catch a little bit of devotion, but the preacher always come at the end, you know, when they did devotion. And I was a child, and I didn’t like to go up to the front of the church. I didn’t like to go all the way up. So I would stop with my friends half way when we’d go in the church and we’d get in and she would look back, “What is wrong with you, come on child”. And it was a little bit, so I’d just, you know, look down and I’d say, “Okay, grandmom, I’m behind you”. And we’d go up and she would, you know, go into her seat, and, you know, and we would be on the seat with her, right. And the children, you know, you know how children are. They [covers mouth while laughing]. They want to stay back and talk a little bit and sneak a little conversation in with. But she was on the money. she didn’t like that. She wanted all the children are on the seat with her. So we had to go up. And I was one that, didn’t, but I had to go up. And so I had to be church-y. Very church-y. But anyway, that’s what I liked about her. She was good.

Emily Varley: How long was she going to that church, do you know?

Annie Mae Stokes: Oh, the church. Ever since I knew my grandmother and was going to church. She was going to church until she got sick. Until. And she got down in about her nineties. Because she went blind but they used to take her anyway. So about ninety years. And
after she went blind, we slacked off on taking her because she wasn’t feeling to well at that time. But she lived, you know, a good while after she went blind.

Emily Varley: Did she ever talk about what her parents were like? Did they live a really long time too?

Annie Mae Stokes: Her…she had a brother. And we called him Uncle Ben and he lived a long time too, Uncle Ben, I believe, died about in his hundreds. I can’t, I don’t know the plus to his hundreds. I know he lived a good while because he, bought one of my brothers a car, yes, so he knew what cars were cuz he wanted to ride where he went but he couldn’t, you know, drive. They weren’t going to give him a license at, you know, ninety-five, and so he bought my brother the car and my brother wanted to go places, you know, before he came down the street so he would come and ask, “Where’s that boy?” you know, and no one knew cuz he didn’t tell anyone where Juggie was. As we called him Juggie, his name was [Jackson]. And he would, you know, “I’m a take my car back cuz he’s never here when I come”. But my brother knew when you took him some place, he stayed a long time. And he wanted to get, to do whatever he wanted to do before Uncle Ben came but that was my grandmother’s brother. But she did have him, and he was married. He had his wife, and they had a beautiful place over there, Jarvista, is what they called it then and he had two or three or four nice pieces of land and he sold it and gave it to, you know, his family, his children, his heirs. But um, yes, I knew him, cuz he would come to his sister’s house, so we grew up with him also. His name was Uncle Ben Meyers. Yes.

Emily Varley: What was his house like, do you remember?

Annie Mae Stokes: Uncle Ben had this big house, and they were, I don’t know, some people, I think they think the children and stuff like that would get hurt or either cuz he had a lot of stuff in there. I went in there a couple of times, and we didn’t go in that house too much. We weren’t scary but a lot of times we didn’t want to get hurt and he saw us, “Don’t y’all go in there now, you know, stay out and play”. We went to certain parts of the house, but it was a huge house, very large, and um, we respected him, you know, and if he said, don’t do it, we didn’t do it. But Jarvy still bought some of that land, there was a big ole building there. I don’t know what he sold, was it a restaurant or something. Jarvista, you remember Jarvista. But anyway, he sold that. Yes, but that was my grandmother’s brother. And like I said, he was loving, he helped the family and some of the land, that he had, we took care of it for the family, and he took care of it also for some of his family. Gave it to them. Yes.

Emily Varley: Wow. But I just want to say if there’s anything else you’d like to talk about or mention.

Annie Mae Stokes: Like I said, I have our, my sister here. And maybe there was something that I left out as she was listening. Give her the honor to say anything that she would like, to, you know say, or ask me or remind me of anything that I left out.
**Shirley Stokes**: The only thing, if I can, is that it was Jarvista, the restaurant cuz Ben, as far as I can relate, cuz my mother had, other family members. She had a sister who is living in Georgia, another sister, and by having family reunions. That’s how we learn a lot of things. And this sister had children, and that’s how we got together and met a few of the family members that we didn’t know.

**Emily Varley**: So, did you go to family reunions in town? In Beaufort?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Yes, we did. And we had it a few years ago. Yes, right here in Beaufort. And there were some family members that I’d never seen. One lady was from Florida. Miami, Florida, and I didn’t know her. But we met and we enjoyed one another. We had a good time. but we did get to meet some families that we’d never known were our family.

**Shirley Stokes**: Yes. And she’s covering mostly family that I can relate to. But I’m saying that she know that I don’t know. I can pick up just going back and forth from my grandmother’s house. She was an older woman. She was blind, but she really wasn’t blind, cuz she knew everything. How much is this? How much is this? If she had money, don’t tell her, it was twenty. Alright, how much is this? Twenty? You know, she was asking to see if you, you know, be truthful. You know. But then, she knew what she had. She knew her money. And she was always like that. Oh yes, she was very sharp. And I remember as a child, at my place, I was to go to my uncle, mister Sam, I was to go and pick up the breakfast, because my aunt was cooking the breakfast and my mother did the dinner. And said that I was coming up. And her breakfast was always oatmeal, that’s all she wanted. A bowl of oatmeal. And she would eat oatmeal and tell her I want for lunch, oatmeal. I said maybe that’s why she lived to 104 because she was a oatmeal lover. And my mother would make the dinner for her, and I would take the dinner when I came from school. She’d wait for her dinner. And that’s what she had us doing, you know. And that’s how I grew up. But at 104 she was sharp. I came out of school in ’68 and I remember she died in ’67, that’s what you said, cuz I remember it was a year before I graduated. Yes.

**Emily Varley**: So, you all would go over to the house all the time then?

**Shirley Stokes**: Oh yes, that was a part of us. You know, we grew up doing that.

**Annie Mae Stokes**: I spent many nights down there with grandmother. I slept down there. And you called Geraldine. And then, Geraldine was closer to me then, you know, the others, they were younger. And we would, you know, laugh and giggle. Do paper dolls and different little things. and we would spend the night down there with my grandmother, yes. Geraldine.

**Paul Keyserling**: Did she talk about her childhood at all? Did your grandmother talk about her childhood at all? What she did when she was a young girl?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Not very much. My grandmother was, I don’t know, she wasn’t a shy person, but she didn’t talk very much of her childhood. She may have talked to Sammie or my
oldest brother, cuz they were, you know, before me. But not to me, no. I just learned of her, everything of her when I got to know her real good. And I got to know her real good.

**Shirley Stokes**: She mostly spoke about her siblings. You know her sisters and brothers but I can't relate to nothing else.

**Annie Mae Stokes**: But her sister…you know, the children. But she didn't talk very much of her childhood to me.

**Emily Varley**: Okay. I have to ask. When you would sleep over at her house, do you remember how she had it decorated and what it was like in there?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Yes, like I said my grandmother was very, very clean. And she didn’t have very many rooms to that house. But in that front bedroom, there was a big bed here and a big bed here [motions arms to the left and then to the right]. Two beds. And she, my cousin and I, Geraldine, we had the bed to the right and grandmother had the bed to the left. And, you know, we giggled, whatever, and she turn over and say, “Stop that playing now” you know, “go to sleep.” And we did. But we slept in that big front bedroom, all of us, but we had our bed and grandma had her bed. Yes.

**Emily Varley**: I remember when we visited--

**Annie Mae Stokes**: One bed.

**Emily Varley**: Well, there was one bed. But there was a lot of light blue paint.

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Yes.

**Emily Varley**: Do you, was that there when you were there?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: I don’t think so, no. Because after grandmother died, the house was fixed up pretty nice then, you know, it wasn’t – definitely not like it is now. My brother he lived in there, yea, I have a brother.

**Shirley Stokes**: It was, you know, it was livable after she died. And he could’ve done the paint. The paint blue.

**Annie Mae Stokes**: The one big bedroom, you know, my cousin, Geraldine and I, slept with my grandma cuz she was getting old, and daddy wanted, you know the children, the girls, sleep and watch. She’s getting lonely. Keep her from getting lonely. Yes.

**Emily Varley**: And I didn’t see it, but where is the fireplace, or, the hearth, in the house?
Annie Mae Stokes: Okay, if you could remember, you remember where someone had gotten a book. Remember I said, there’s a book or something. Okay. Where you went to get that book, in the living room, that was the living room, the fireplace was in the living room. You know, it was to the front. This is the living room, the fireplace was [motions up and down to the right] and the wall, this is the living room, and the fireplace was to the front of the living room. Not where the door is.

Shirley Stokes: Where you walk to the right of the house. Over there. That old coat you see, focus right over to the right. That was the fireplace.

Annie Mae Stokes: If you could remember. Yea, I’m trying to just picture. Give you a picture of it. And that’s where I used to bake our potatoes. Yes, and she had a kitchen, and we do the cooking but that was our snack bar.

Nathan Betcher: Was there a room of the house that was your favorite? It sounded like front porch where you spent a lot of time, was a favorite of yours? Was that your favorite spot?

Annie Mae Stokes: Yes, yes. It was one of the favorite spots. That she had a rocking chair in the living room. And she would, after she had a snack for the night – you know, her little potato, and – so, she would sorta rock herself to sleep. You know, a little bit take back nod, you know. And we would be giggling or playing and, “Children, y’all better get ready to go to bed.” But she would stay up till a little later time and she would go. But that was her second spot on the front porch. But her first spot was right there in that living room in that rocking chair in the front of that fire, especially in the wintertime. She – the winter is cold – but that fireplace gave off a lot of heat. Maybe we were used to it I guess. But she was in the living room most of the time. And on the porch is where she shell her beans and her peas or. When they come by, entertain a lot of the ladies cuz they sat with her. Yes. And the pump was right over there by the fence. Pump. We pumped water. And we got a cool drink of water right out the pump cuz that water was cool. I guess cuz it had the well or something, you know, water under the – the well, or something but that how the pump is made. But we’d pump, you know, water and we drank nice glass of cool water. We didn’t need too much ice. We didn’t get much ice. Because she had to preserve that ice to keep the refrigerator cool, you know. And then you had a go a little distance to get that ice. Had to go up Burton Hill. I don’t know if you travel Beaufort and Burton? And the big ole icehouse was, as you go up the hill, the big icehouse was – I’m trying to – the big icehouse is to the left. It might be still there. I think, is it there.

Emily Varley: Isn’t the road called icehouse road or something?

Annie Mae Stokes: Yes.

Emily Varley: I’ve been on the road.

Annie Mae Stokes: You go up the hill and that’s where we used to go to get the ice.
Shirley Stokes: You know, clothesline. We would do clothesline in the back of the house. I heard them talk about the clothesline.

Annie Mae Stokes: Uh huh. The clotheslines. Yes, she hung our clothes back, she hung our clothes on the line. You know, we have dryer now. She didn’t even know about a dryer. Washing machine and dryer. She wash our clothes in the tub. Wash them and then rinse in another tub. And then from there. Rinse to the line.

Emily Varley: Do you know – we think that the house has an addition on it, the back of the house, do you remember when that happened? Or hearing about it? Or was it always how it is now?

Annie Mae Stokes: Yes, yes. Okay, no, it wasn’t always like it is now. It was, lets see, smaller. I think it was smaller. It had to be smaller. Cuz that’s addition. But she had a kitchen. It had a kitchen. But maybe, they could’ve taken or add onto that little piece. I think they added onto that little piece.

Shirley Stokes: That’s all it was. The addition was just – I think the little extension within, cuz it needed bathroom and things that were changing. The bathroom and back bedroom. That’s what it was. But as far – she had a kitchen, like she said, and I think it was –

Annie Mae Stokes: Very little. A little piece. A little kitchen and a little bathroom.

Shirley Stokes: City of Beaufort, you know, they allowed that. You know. They had that.

Annie Mae Stokes: And then, you know, they added a little piece more. And extended it a little bit. But she had, ours had a kitchen cuz I had –

Shirley Stokes: Yea, cuz we can’t have two bedrooms. It was one bedroom. Is what she’s saying. Then became two.

Emily Varley: Do you remember when that might’ve happened?

Annie Mae Stokes: Let’s see. Well, I probably then was about, maybe, 12, 13, years old. Cuz it wasn’t there when I was smaller or younger than 12. But at 12, she and I, or whoever, would go and try to cook different things back there on the little stove. She had a stove; she had a wood stove. And she cooked on, by wood, you know. So, you put your wood in.

Emily Varley: Did you have to chop the wood? Who chopped the wood?

Annie Mae Stokes: Well, daddy. Daddy took her the wood. Yea. And sometimes, splinters like the tree limbs and things. She didn’t throw it away, she used it, you know, put it the stove and the fireplace. You know, so, they didn’t throw away those kind of things cuz it was useful to
them. So she used the little splinter wood to put in there so she wouldn’t have to cut em, you know, with the axe or anything until daddy brought her.

**Shirley Stokes**: And that was also my father’s business, you know, he was into the wood business so. That was his job. That’s what he did.

**Paul Keyserling**: Did she have electricity in the house when you were really young? Or did she use kerosene?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: How did she do what now?

**Paul Keyserling**: How did she light the house?

**Shirley Stokes**: Wood. The heat.

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Okay, wood.

**Paul Keyserling**: What about light?

**Shirley Stokes**: Oh she –

**Annie Mae Stokes**: She light –

**Shirley Stokes**: How was it? They had lamps, didn’t they have lamps?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Oh, yes.

**Shirley Stokes**: Lamps. They had lamps.

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Yea, grandma didn’t have no light. I’m sorry I was trying to figure out what he said – I’m sorry. But no, she had lamps. Yea she had lamps. She had a lamp she didn’t. You know. She would bring the kerosene, I don’t know if you hear of kerosene. Kerosene was used at that time and they would put it in the lamp and put the shade on lamp and turn the [turns fingers like twisting a knob] wick up or down. Later the wick turn it down and it dims the light and then if you turn it up, the light would become bright. Yea, she used lamps. She didn’t have any lights. My grandmother didn’t even have air conditioner. The windows. You got air. But when electricity came through, she got it wired. She might’ve gotten a little fan, you know, to get a little air. Just to be maybe modern a little. I couldn’t even remember having a fan in there cuz they used to up the window and let the air come in. So we got lots of fresh air. Yes. We didn’t have.

**Paul Keyserling**: What about plumbing? Do you remember that? Water? You had the pump outside. Do you remember when she got indoor plumbing?

**Annie Mae Stokes**: Yea. When she got the pump. No, I grew into the pump.
Paul Keyserling: No, inside the house.

Annie Mae Stokes: The pump was outside.

Paul Keyserling: Right. Do you remember when she had it brought into the house?

Shirley Stokes: The electricity. The plumbing.

Emily Varley: The plumbing.

Annie Mae Stokes: Yea, I was trying to think.

Paul Keyserling: Do you remember where the outhouse was?

Annie Mae Stokes: That was in the back. I was trying to think. I gotta go back a little bit. The outhouse was in the back. But I was trying to think when she put that toilet in, in the bathroom. I believe I was about 13 or 14 years old at that particular time. But the outhouse was there before I was about 12. It was there but I can't quite remember, you know, the exact time that was.

Shirley Stokes: But he said, where was the outhouse?

Annie Mae Stokes: Yea.

Shirley Stokes: Where was it?

Annie Mae Stokes: It was in the back, I told him it was out back. In the backyard.

Paul Keyserling: What was behind the house? Do you remember? Was it just a field? Or was there some building back there?

Annie Mae Stokes: No, it was a wood house. A little ole wood house in the back. And she had it. I was trying to bring to my attention where that outer house. You know where the back door, sorta back door. Go out grandma back door to the left, to the left, to the left of the house, was the outhouse. To the right was her chicken coop, chicken house, that’s where she kept, over that side. As I can remember. And a little further, after that outhouse, were some trees that was the fig trees. Like going toward the street. She had a big fig tree there. And I can't remember the plum tree. Shirley said she had a plum tree but I do remember the fig tree cuz that’s where she canned, got the figs and canned but I don't remember plum tree. But the outhouse was to the left when you go out the back door. It was to the left. And the chicken coop was to the right. Yea. She had a nice size backyard. She had a good backyard.
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Consultant Recommendation:
Name: 

Previous Survey:
☐ H.A.B.S.
☐ Feiss-Wright (1969)
☒ Historic Resources of the Lowcountry (1979)
☐ Miner Historic District Inventory (1979)

Photograph:

Photographs:
☒ prints
☐ slides
☒ negatives

Date: 8/1/97
Recorder: D. Schneider, Historic Beaufort Fdn.

Roll # Neg. View of:
S-12 5 S facade & W elev., fac. NE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style:</th>
<th>Commercial Form:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Shape:</td>
<td>Stories: 1.5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Shape:</td>
<td>Construction: frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney: Type:</td>
<td>Material: other metal-V cmp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Walls:</td>
<td>Material: brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Height:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Related Resources:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surroundings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrangle:</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations:</td>
<td>Alteration date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity: good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition: good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plastic at windows; infilled window at gable end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** 3 x 1 bay block w/rear 1 bay deep shed addition

**Historical Data:** Shown on the 1924 Sanborn map; area is not shown on earlier maps

**Sketch:**

---

Informant/Bibliography:

Brockington Associates, Inc. • Brocker Architectural Design Consultants • Historic Beaufort Foundation • Preservation Consultants, Inc.
Appendix D: Deed Book 19, Page 391, US Govt. to Morcock (1874)
Appendix E: Deed Book 21, Page 330, Christensen to Reddick (1896)
The State of South Carolina,

County of Beaufort,

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS,

that I, Affy Simmons, of Beaufort, County aforesaid,

In consideration of the sum of Two hundred and Ten Dollars, to be paid to me in lawful money at and before the delivery of these presents, by my daughter, Rina Gregory, the free and perfect act of my free will, and in my undisturbed possession of my right, title, and interest in and to the premises described in the indenture contained in these presents ...

Rina Gregory of St. Helena Island, being duly sworn, says that the premises described in these presents, to wit, the land and dwelling house thereon situate, are free and clear of all encumbrances, and that the same are her own and personal property ...

AND I, Affy Simmons, do hereby bind myself, my executors, administrators, and assigns, to warrant and forever defend, and forever quit my title to the said premises, and to execute and deliver the same, to my daughter, Rina Gregory ...

The State of South Carolina,

County of Beaufort,

Wherefore, the premises described herein are hereby conveyed to Rina Gregory ...

Affy Simmons
N. S. Revis

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

County of Beaufort

PERSONAL Appearance before me, N. S. Revis,Administrator, to wit, at the ... of the said premises ...

Witness my hand and seal ...

N. S. Revis

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

County of Beaufort

In consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars, I, Affy Simmons, do hereby transfer, release, and forever quit my title to the said premises ...

Affy Simmons

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

County of Beaufort

Deed Book 26, Page 59, Affy Simmons to Rina Gregory (1904)
Appendix G: Deed Book 31, Page 421, Christensen to Reddick (1911)

The State of South Carolina. I KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, 421 THAT

W. L. Christensen, and Fredrick N. Christensen, of Beaufort, in the State aforesaid, 

in consideration of the sum of One Hundred Dollars, to be paid to the said W. L. Christensen and Fredrick N. Christensen, the consideration hereinafter mentioned, the said W. L. Christensen and Fredrick N. Christensen, have granted, released, and conveyed, and by these Presents do grant, release, and convey unto the said

Walter Reddick, in the State aforesaid,

All that certain piece, parcel or set of land, situated in the City of Charleston, and the County of Charleston, and the State of South Carolina, being a part of Block One Hundred (100) acres, more or less, in the Survey of United States, made by the Surveyor General for the State of South Carolina, but not particularly described and enclosed as follows, to wit: Starting at a rock 30 feet due South of said Block One Hundred (100) acres, one foot from the north boundary and black on Sixteenth avenue, and running thence Southly and Eastly 100 feet to a rock 30 feet more due South ofsaid Block One Hundred (100) acres; thence north 100 feet, and thence south 100 feet to the point of beginning, together with all and singular the rights, titles, tenements, and estates in the said premises, or in any way incident or appertaining thereto, to have and to hold all and singular, the said premises before mentioned unto the said Walter Reddick, his heirs and assigns forever.

And we, the above named, our heirs and assigns, do hereby bind ourselves, our heirs, executors and administrators, as well in law as in equity, to warrant and forever defend, all and singular, the said premises, or any part thereof for the use, benefit and profit of the said Walter Reddick, his heirs and assigns.

WITNESS: 

Allin L. Cawse 

Fredrick N. Christensen

The State of South Carolina, } PERSONALLY appeared before me, W. L. Cawse, and made

the within acknowledged, and Fredrick N. Christensen, and acknowledged the same, the record hereunto annexed, and I did then and there subscribe my name to the same in presence of the said W. L. Cawse.

Sworn to before me, this 14th day of December, 1911.

W. L. Cawse

Recording Officer

The State of South Carolina, }

do hereby certify unto all whom it may concern, that Mrs. Anna Christensen, wife of the within named

Walter Reddick, and upon being required and respecting the same, that she does freely, voluntarily and without any compulsion, fraud or fear of any person or persons, whatsoever, transfer, release and forever relinquish unto the within named

Anna Christensen, all her interest and estate, and also all her right and claim of devisee, or, in all and singular the premises within

RECEIVED the sum of One Hundred Dollars, in the manner and form above mentioned, given me by the said Walter Reddick.

Recording Officer

14th day of December, 1911.
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County of Beaufort.

Appendix H: Deed Book 44, Page 195, Christensen to Meyers (1925)

Book 44

The State of South Carolina, in consideration of the sum of Six Hundred and fifty DOLLARS, to be paid in full and before the sealing of these Presents, by Ben Myers of Beaufort in the State aforesaid, for and in the State aforesaid, the said sum to be paid to Henry D. Craig, his heirs and assigns, for and in the State aforesaid, in consideration of the conveyance of a parallelogram on the North side of Block 120 according to the survey of the U.S. Direct Tax Commissioners for S.C., its northern side coincides with the southern edge of Boundary or K street for a distance of seventy (70) feet, its eastern side lies eighty (80) feet west from the western edge of Barrington or K11.01, and is parallel to it running back from K street for one hundred (100) feet. This lot is bounded on the east by a strip of fifty (50) feet of hand between this lot and that of Henry S. Wrenn, on the south by lot of W. W. McDowell, and on the west by lot of the grantors.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD all and singular, the said premises and all appurtenances to the said premises belonging, or in any wise belonging or appertaining, TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, all and singular, the said premises before mentioned unto the said Henry D. Craig, his

AND we, the said Henry D. Craig, his heirs and assigns forever, do hereby bind ourselves, our heirs, Executors and Administrators, to execute and forever

For and in the State aforesaid.

AND we, the said Ben Myers, his heirs and assigns, for and in the State aforesaid, do hereby bind ourselves, our heirs, Executors and Administrators, to execute and forever

For and in the State aforesaid.

Witness our Hand and Seal, this 12th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and in the unnumbered forty-ninth year of the Independence of the United States of America.

J. F. Waddox.

Witnesses for the Deed of Conveyance.

M. E. Christensen.

Frederick H. Christensen.

Benjamin, County.

Robert E. Myers.

Beaufort, County.

T. H. Ham, Notary Public.

REMNUNCIATION OF DOWER

The State of South Carolina.

Benjamin, County.

T. H. Ham, Notary Public.

I, T. H. Ham, Notary Public, do hereby certify unto all whom

It may concern that Mrs. M. E. Christensen, wife of the within named, M. E. Christensen,

Did this day appear before me, and upon being examined by me, did declare that the act herein voluntarily and without any compulsion, threat or fear of any person or persons whatsoever, executed, released and forever relinquished unto the within named

Heirs and Assigns, all my interest and estate, and also all my right and claim of Dower in, in or to all and singular the premises within mentioned and released.

Given under my hand and seal, this 12th day of February, A.D. MCMXXV.

T. H. Ham. (Seal)

Notary Public.

Recorded and certified this 16th day of December, A.D. MCMXXV.

C.C.P.
Appendix I: Deed Book 62, Page 130, Christensen to Gant (1944)
Appendix K: Deed Book 65, Page 23, Christensen to Stokes (1946)
WHEREAS Edith Stokes, also known as E. D. Stokes, died intestate in Beaufort County, South Carolina, on February 27, 1967, and

WHEREAS Edith Stokes died seized and possessed of 2 lots of land on the north side of Congress Street, in Block 100, in the City of Beaufort, the first lot being described as being bounded on the south by Congress Street and measuring thereon 40 ft. and on the west by Wilmington Street and measuring thereon 100 ft., and being rectangular in shape and having been acquired by Deed from N. Christensen & Sons Company, dated January 12, 1945, and recorded in Deed Book 62 at Page 279, in the records of Beaufort County, and which lot is now identified as District 120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 47; and a second lot immediately east of and adjacent to, the first lot above-described, which lot is described as being rectangular in shape, and measuring 75 ft. on Congress Street, and 110 ft. on its eastern and western boundaries, having been acquired from N. Christensen Sons Company by Deed recorded December 30, 1946, in Deed Book 65 at Page 23, which lot is now shown as District 120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 47-A, and

WHEREAS, Edith Stokes left surviving her four (4) children, to wit: Sam Stokes, Booker T. Stokes, Lillian Stokes Washington, and Bertha Stokes Harris, and

WHEREAS, Lillian Stokes Washington and Bertha Stokes Harris conveyed their interest in the lot at the corner of Washington and Wilmington Streets to their brother, Sam Stokes, by Deeds recorded in Book 258, at Page 966, and Book 267, at Page 1528, in the records of Beaufort County, South Carolina, and

WHEREAS, Sam Stokes died intestate in Beaufort County, leaving his interest in the property to his widow Mamie L. Stokes and his daughter, Geraldine Vernell Wilds, and

WHEREAS, Booker T. Stokes died intestate in Beaufort County, South Carolina, on March 5, 1976, leaving surviving his widow, Annie Mae Stokes, and eight children, in

WHEREAS, Mamie L. Stokes and Vernell Wilds wish to convey to Annie Mae Stokes all of their right, title, and interest in and to, the lot at the corner of Congress and Wilmington Streets, in return for the heirs of Booker T. Stokes conveying all of their right, title, and interest in and to the lot immediately adjoining to the east, now sometimes known as the Salvation Army store property.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, THAT we, Mamie L. Stokes of 803 Congress Street, Beaufort, SC, and Geraldine Vernell Wilds of
Brooklyn, NY, for and in consideration of ONE AND NO/100 ($1.00) DOLLAR, and love and affection, to us in hand paid by Annie Mae Stokes of 1401 Washington St., Beaufort, SC 29902, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have granted, bargained, sold, and released unto the said Annie Mae Stokes, her heirs and assigns forever, all of our right, title, and interest in and to the following described property, TO WIT:

All that certain piece, parcel or lot of land, and the house thereon, situate, lying, and being at the southwest corner of Block 100 in the City of Beaufort, and being bounded on the south by Congress Street and measuring thereon, 40 ft. more or less, on the west by Wilmington St. and measuring thereon, 100.16 ft. more or less, and on the north by lands of others, measuring thereon 40 ft. more or less, and on the east by land of the grantors known as the Salvation Army Store property and measuring thereon, 100.16 ft. more or less. All as shown on Plat F-5220 prepared by Neil Christensen, IV, RLS, dated February 19, 1990.

This Deed was prepared by W. Brantley Harvey, Jr., Esq., of the law firm of Harvey & Battey, P.A., 1001 Craven Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902.

TOGETHER with all and singular, the Rights, Members, Hereditaments and Appurtenances to the said Premises belonging, or in anywise incident or appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, all and singular, the said Premises before mentioned unto the said Annie Mae Stokes, her Heirs and Assigns forever.

AND we do hereby bind ourselves and our Heirs, Executors and Administrators, to warrant and forever defend, all and singular, the said Premises unto the said Annie Mae Stokes, her Heirs and Assigns, against us and our Heirs, and all persons whomsoever lawfully claiming, or to claim the same or any part thereof.
WITNESS our Hands and Seals, this 17th day of July in the
year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ninety-one and in
the two hundred and fifteenth year of the Soveraigny and
Independence of the United States of America.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF:

Susan M. Janier

Namie L. Stokes

(1.S.)

Geraldine Vellmille

(1.S.)

Susan M. Janier

Susan Carrol.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT COUNTY

PERSONALLY appeared before me Susan M. Janier
and made oath that s/he saw the within named Namie L. Stokes sign,
seal, and as her act and deed, deliver the within written Deed, and
that she with Susan Partridge witnessed the execution thereof.

SWORN to before me, this 17th
day of July, A.D. 1991:

Suzan Carrol

Rotary Public of South Carolina
My Commission Expires: 4/4/92
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT COUNTY  

PERSONALLY appeared before me Susan M. Lannier 
and made oath that s/he saw the within named GERALDINE VERNELL 
WILDS sign, seal, and as her act and deed, deliver the within 
written Deed, and that she with 
witnessed the execution thereof. 

Susan M. Lannier
Notary Public of South Carolina

SWORN to before me, this 12th 
day of July, A.D. 1991:

Notary Public

RECORDED THIS 26th 
DAY 
OF 
JULY
1991
IN BOOK X PAGE 493

AUDITOR, BEAUFORT COUNTY, S.C.

15/1991
579
657

JUDICIAL OFFICER OF REAL CONVEYANCES
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  }  PROBATE COURT
COUNTY OF BEAUFORT  }  

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF ANNIE MAE STOKES
CASE NUMBER 92ES0700367

DEED OF DISTRIBUTION

WHEREAS, the decedent died on the 11th day of April, 1992; and,

WHEREAS, the estate of the decedent is being administered in the Probate Court for Beaufort County, South Carolina in File #92ES0700367; and,

WHEREAS, the grantees herein are either beneficiaries or heirs at law, as appropriate, of the decedent; and,

WHEREAS, the undersigned Personal Representative is the duly appointed and qualified fiduciary in this matter; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the laws of the State of South Carolina, the Personal Representative has granted, bargained, sold and released, and by these presents does grant, bargain, sell and release to:

Mr. Sammie L. Stokes
24549 Myers Avenue
Moreno Valley, CA  92388

Mr. Leroy Stokes
906 Wilmington Avenue
Beaufort, SC  29902

Mr. Jackson Stokes
1313 Congress Street
Beaufort, SC  29902

Mr. Ralph Stokes
1401 Washington Street
Beaufort, SC  29902

Ms. Annie M. Carson
1204 Valentine Street
Killeen, TX  76542

Ms. Carolyn Alston
669 East 230 Street
Bronx, NY  10466
Ms. Cynthia Swain  
713 Helen Street  
Fayetteville, NC  28303  

Ms. Shirley Stokes  
669 East 230 Street  
Bronx, NY  10466  

an undivided one-eighth (1/8) interest in the following described property:  

ALL that certain piece, parcel or lot of land and the house thereon, situate, lying and being at the southwest corner of block 100 in the City of Beaufort, and being bounded on the south by Congress Street and measuring thereon, forty (40') feet more or less, on the west by Wilmington Street and measuring thereon 100.16 feet more or less, and on the east by land of the grantors known as the Salvation Army Store property and measuring thereon, 100.16 feet more or less, all as shown on Plat F 5220 prepared by Neils Christensen, IV, R.L.S. dated February 19, 1990.  

This being the same property conveyed to the decedent by Mamie L. Stokes and Geraldine Vernell Wilds and recorded in the Office of the Register of Meynes Conveyances for Beaufort County, South Carolina in Deed Book 579 at Page 657 on the 15th day of July, 1991.  

TOGETHER with all and singular, the Rights, Members, Hereditaments and Appurtenances to the said Premises/Property belonging, or in anywise incident or appertaining.  

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, all and singular, the said Premises/Property unto the said Leroy Stokes, Shirley E. Stokes, Sammie Stokes, Carolyn Alston, Cynthia Swain, Ralph Stokes, Jackson Stokes and Annie Carson, their heirs and assigns forever.  

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, as Personal Representative of the estate of the decedent, has executed this Deed, this 28th day of December, 1993.  

Signature:  Shirley C. Stokes  
Personal Representative  

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED IN THE PRESENCE OF  

Witness:  

Sworn To Before Me  
This 28 Day of Dec 1993  
Notary Public  

Witness:  

Camilas Joseph  

178
STATE OF SOUTH-CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF BEAUFORT  

PERSONALLY appeared before me
and made oath that he/she saw the within named "Personal
Representative(s)" sign, seal, and as their act and deed, deliver
the within written Deed, and that he/she with BENJAMIN
ASTAIK witnessed the execution thereof.

Witness Signature: ____________________________

SWORN to before me this  28th     day of   April 1993.

Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires:    7/29/95
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Appendix N: US Army Navy Certificate No. 96, US Govt. to Daniel Simmons (1864)
This Certifies, That at a sale of lands under and by virtue of the provisions of the eleventh section of an act entitled "An act for the collection of Direct Taxes in Insurrectionary Districts within the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 1, 1862, and under and by virtue of the direction and instructions of the President of the United States issued in pursuance of the same, under date of September 15, 1863, held pursuant to due notice, at

Beaufort
in the District of Beaufort
in the State of South Carolina, on the twenty-ninth day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, from the tract or parcel of land hereinafter set forth, situate in the

Town of Beaufort
in the District of Beaufort
and State aforesaid, and described as follows, to wit:

All of Block One hundred and four according to the 1st section in the Office of the U.S. District

1st Commissioner for the District of South Carolina

was sold and struck off to Daniel Sommers for the sum of One hundred and sixty dollars, he being the highest bidder for the same, and having faithfully served as a volunteer in the Army of the United States for the full period of three months, and that being the highest sum bid for the same, the receipt of one hundred and sixty dollars, whereof is hereby acknowledged and confessed; and it is hereby expressly stipulated and agreed between the United States and the said purchaser, that the residuum of said purchase money shall be paid in five years from the date of said purchase, and that this certificate is given subject to the condition that he, his heirs or assigns, shall commit no waste upon said premises; and in case he or they shall fail to pay the residuum of the said purchase money within the time herein limited for the payment thereof, in whole or in part, or shall, at any time prior to the full payment of said purchase money in such an amount or proportion as the President of the United States shall direct.
This Certifies, That at a sale of lands under and by virtue of the provisions of the eleventh section of an act entitled "An act for the collection of Direct Taxes in Insurrectionary Districts within the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 1, 1862, and under and by virtue of the direction and instructions of the President of the United States issued in pursuance of the same, under date of September 18, 1862, held pursuant to due notice, at

in the District of Beaufort
in the State of South Carolina, on the twenty-eighth day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, the tract or parcel of land hereinafter set forth, situate in the Town of Beaufort in the District of Beaufort and State aforesaid, and described as follows, to wit:

All of Block One hundred (100) according to the plat recorded in the Office of the Clerk of the Commissioners for the District of South Carolina

was sold and struck off to Daniel Simmons

for the sum of One hundred and sixty dollars, he being the highest bidder for the same, and having faithfully served as a volunteer in the Army of the United States for the full period of three months, and that being the highest sum bid for the same, the receipt of one-portion thereof is hereby acknowledged and confessed; and it is hereby expressly stipulated and agreed between the United States and the said purchaser, that the residue of said purchase money shall be paid in three years from the date of said purchase, and that this certificate is given subject to the condition that he, his heirs or assigns, shall commit no waste upon said premises; and in case he or they shall fail to pay the residue of the said purchase money within the time herein limited for the payment thereof, to wit, the period of three years or shall, at any time prior to the full payment of said purchase money in cash or certificates of indebtedness of the United States, with interest, if any,
due upon the same, together with costs, commit any waste, it shall and may be lawful for the United States Direct Tax Commissioners for the State aforesaid, or their successors in office, to enter upon the said premises, and to sell the same for the payment of the purchase money due the United States, interest, if any, and costs, returning the surplus, if any there shall be, to the said purchaser, his heirs or assigns, holding the same. And this certificate is also subject to all the provisions of said act, and of the act amendatory of the same, approved February 9, 1863.

This is under our hands, at Beaufort, in the District of Beaufort, in the State aforesaid, this first day of February, A.D. 1864.

[Signature]

W. C. Wood

Mary Knowlton

U.S. Direct Tax Commissioners

for the District of South Carolina.
Appendix O: Diagrams of Block 100 Landownership Pre-1861 to 1946

Block 100 Land Owners Timeline (Pre-1861 to 1946)

Pre-1861
*William Avis Morcock*

1861-1864
*United States Government*

1864-1874
*Daniel Simmons*
1874
*United States Government*

1874-1877
*William Avis Morcock*

1877-1896
*Niels Christensen*
1896-1946
Multiple Owners